

THE
British Critic,
QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

No. XXXV.—JULY, 1835.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

AT TOR, NEAR TORQUAY, an ESTABLISHMENT for a few YOUNG LADIES is conducted by Mrs. JOHN GRENFELL, Widow of the late Mr. John Grenfell. The Establishment has been conducted by Mrs. Grenfell and her Daughters for Sixteen Years, who are thus experienced in all that promotes the improvement and happiness of Young Ladies. The Tuition is conducted entirely by the Misses Grenfell.

The Harp, Piano, and Singing, are taught by Miss Grenfell, who has been a Pupil of BOCHSA, MOSCHELLES, and CREVELLI.

Any Young Lady requiring the mild air of South Devon, will find at Tor all that a beautiful country can offer either for health or amusement.

For Terms apply to Messrs. Darton and Harvey, Gracechurch-street; or Messrs. Willis and Co. Music Warehouse, St. James's-street.

GILBERT'S CLERICAL GUIDE.—NEW EDITION.

In the press and speedily will be published, in One Volume,
a New Edition of

THE CLERICAL GUIDE and ECCLESIASTICAL DIRECTORY; containing a complete Register of the DIGNITIES and BENEFICES of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, with the NAMES of their present POSSESSORS, PATRONS, &c.; and an Alphabetical List of the Dignitaries and Beneficed Clergy.

Edited by RICHARD GILBERT, M.R.S.L.

Compiler of the "Clergyman's Almanack" and the "Liber Scholasticus."

This Edition will contain an Account of the *present value* of the Archbishopricks, Bishopricks, Dignities, and all other Ecclesiastical Preferments, extracted from the Report of his Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Ecclesiastical Revenues. The Names of the Incumbents have been carefully corrected to the *present time*; and the Population of each Parish is inserted from the latest Official Returns. The Appendix will contain an Account of the Ecclesiastical Patronage at the disposal of the King, the Lord Chancellor, Archbishops and Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Universities, &c.

Printing for J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

Vindication of the Authority of the Christian Priesthood.

In small 8vo. price 3s. 6d. boards,

THE FIRST and SECOND of LAW'S THREE LETTERS to BISHOP HOADLEY, in Answer to his Lordship's Sermon on the Nature of Christ's Kingdom, and his Notions of the Authority of the Christian Priesthood.

•• The present Edition of these Letters is brought forward in answer to some opinions reproduced by Dr. ARNOLD in his late publications.

Printed for J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall-Mall.

In 12mo. price 2s.

LETTERS FOR THE POOR ON RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.
By the Author of "TWELVE PLAIN SERMONS, preached in a Village Church.

Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo Place, Pall-Mall.

Just published, in 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

The Divine Patience exhausted through the making void the Divine Law.

A SERMON Preached at Camden Chapel, Camberwell, on Sunday, the 26th April, 1835. Published at the request of the Congregation.
By HENRY MELVILL, A.M. Minister of the Chapel, and late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo Place.

In 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPY.

A SPITAL SERMON, Preached before the **LORD MAYOR** and **CORPORATION** of the **CITY of LONDON**, at Christ Church, Newgate-street, on Easter Tuesday, April 21st, 1835.

By the Rev. JAMES S. M. ANDERSON, M.A.

Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Perpetual Curate of St. George's Chapel, Brighton, and Chaplain to the Sussex County Hospital.

Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo Place, London; sold by J. H. Parker, Oxford; and all the booksellers in Brighton.

Lately published by the same Author,

DISCOURSES on **ELIJAH** and **JOHN the BAPTIST.** 8vo. 10s. 6d.

This day is published in 12mo. price 6s. in boards, the Third Volume of

PLAIN PAROCHIAL SERMONS, Preached in the Parish Church of Bolton-le-Moors.

By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A., Vicar of Bolton, and Prebendary of Chester.

Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo Place, Pall-Mall.

Of whom may be had the First and Second Volumes, price 6s. each.

This day is published, Second Edition, 8vo. 12s. boards,

THE MINISTERIAL CHARACTER of CHRIST, Practically Considered. By CHARLES RICHARD SUMNER, D.D.

Lord Bishop of Winchester.

In this Edition Four New Chapters are inserted, and considerable additions are made in the other parts of the volume.

London: John Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly.

DR. GREEN ON DISEASES OF THE SKIN.

Just published in 8vo. price 12s. boards,
By permission, dedicated to Sir Henry Hallford, Bart. &c. &c.

A PRACTICAL COMPENDIUM of the DISEASES of the SKIN, including a Particular Consideration of the more frequent and intractable forms of these Affections. Illustrated by Numerous Cases. By JONATHAN GREEN, M.D., 40, Great Marlborough-street, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, and formerly Surgeon in his Majesty's Royal Navy.

"It has been the author's aim in this Compendium to condense within the smallest possible space, not merely the results of his own experience, but the whole amount of practical information extant upon this highly-important class of diseases. His most particular attention is constantly given to the characters by which they may be distinguished one from another, and to the most approved and available means of treatment recommended for their cure. This is an excellent compendium, evincing great experience and success on the part of the author," &c.—*Dr. Ryan's Surgical and Medical Journal*.

"We earnestly recommend those who are interested in the subject not only to read this book, but to put the efficacy of the agent to the test."—*London Medical Gazette*.

"Dr. Green is known to the profession to have an extensive practice in skin diseases, and in this book they are very accurately described," &c.—*London Medical and Surgical Journal*.

"We can state from our own knowledge of the benefits experienced by numerous patients, and heartily recommend both the work and the system it advocates," &c.—*Literary Gazette*.

"This highly valuable work is, or ought to be, addressed exclusively to the profession," &c.—*Athenæum*.

London: Whittaker and Co. Publishers.

TEGG'S CHRONOLOGY, CORRECTED TO 1835.

In One Volume, duodecimo, closely printed in Double Columns, price 6s. in cloth boards,

A DICTIONARY OF CHRONOLOGY; OR HISTORICAL COMPANION; being an authentic Register of Events from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. The Fourth Edition, considerably enlarged, edited by

THOMAS TEGG.

London: Printed for Thomas Tegg and Son, 73, Cheapside; Griffin and Co. Glasgow; Tegg, Wise, and Co. Dublin; and may be procured, by order, of any other bookseller in the United Kingdom.

This day was published, in one large volume, 8vo. with an engraved Plan of Ancient Rome, price 10s. 6d. boards,

ROMAN ANTIQUITIES, or an Account of the Manners and Customs of the Romans; designed chiefly to illustrate the Latin Classics, by explaining words and phrases from the Rites and Customs to which they refer.

By ALEXANDER ADAM, LL.D. Rector of the High School, Edinburgh.

The Twelfth Edition, corrected, improved, and enlarged,

By the Rev. J. R. MAJOR, M.A. M.R.S.L.
Head Master of King's College School, London.

* * This New Edition contains Notes and an Appendix, enlarged Indices, &c. and other additions furnished from the Rev. Mr. Tate's copy of Dr. Adam's Work, with a few pages from his pen of original remarks on the peculiar merits of the Work, and the enlarged views which may be advantageously combined with its perusal.

London: printed for T. Cadell, Longman, Rees, and Co.; J. G. and F. Rivington; J. Booker; Baldwin and Cradock; Tegg and Son; Hamilton and Co.; J. Duncan, Cowie and Co.; Whittaker and Co.; Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.; Houlston and Son; J. Parker, Oxford; Bell and Bradfute, and Stirling and Kenney, Edinburgh.

NEW EDITION OF STEWART'S GEOGRAPHY,

Carefully revised, enlarged, and brought down to the present day,

This day is published,

In One Volume, 3s. 6d. neatly bound, illustrated by Ten New Maps constructed for the Work, and an Engraving showing the Heights of the Principal Mountains on the Globe, the Fifth Edition of

A COMPENDIUM OF MODERN GEOGRAPHY: with Remarks on the Physical Peculiarities, Productions, Commerce, and Government of the various Countries; Questions for Examination at the end of each Division; and Descriptive Tables, in which are given the Pronunciation, and a concise Account of every Place of Importance throughout the World.

By the Rev. ALEXANDER STUART.

In preparing the present edition of this Compendium for the press, neither labour nor expense has been spared to render it still more deserving of the preference which has been given to it, both by Teachers and by the Public. Every part of it has been minutely and carefully revised, and the utmost attention has been bestowed on the facts and descriptions, with the view of maintaining its character for accuracy of detail. Besides various improvements throughout, this impression will be found to embrace a great deal of valuable geographical knowledge, derived from the most recent and authentic sources, Foreign as well as British; the extent of which can only be fully appreciated by an examination of the Work itself. The Descriptive Tables are considerably enlarged, and to all the more important cities, seaports, capes, &c., the latitude and longitude have been added. The description of the American Continent, besides being enriched with much additional information, is now rendered more conformable to the general plan. An accurate set of Maps has been prepared strictly adapted to the text, and including all the latest discoveries. Upon the whole, this Edition is sent forth in the confident expectation, that it will be found still more entitled than any of its predecessors to the high degree of popular favour with which the Work has been every where received.

Also lately published,

STEWART'S HISTORY of SCOTLAND. 12mo. 5s. boards.

————— STORIES from the HISTORY of SCOTLAND. 18mo. 4s. half-bound.

————— Improved Edition of GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of ENGLAND. 12mo. 5s. bound.

————— Improved Edition of CORNELIUS NEPOS. 18mo. 3s. bound.

————— Improved Edition of MAIR'S INTRODUCTION TO LATIN SYNTAX. 18mo. 3s. bound, or without Vocabularies, 2s.

Printed for Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh; and Simpkin, Marshall and Co. London.

Just published, price 5s. 6d.

CONGREGATIONAL REFORM, according to the Liturgy of the Church of England. By the Rev. PETER HALL, M.A.

Rector of Milston, Wilts, and Curate of St. Luke's, Chelsea.

London: Hamilton and Adams, Paternoster-row; and T. Combe, jun. Leicester.

This day is published, 8vo. price 10s.

THE ACHARNENSES OF ARISTOPHANES, with English Notes, Critical and Explanatory. Adapted to the use of Schools and Universities. By THOMAS MITCHELL, A.M. late Fellow of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

In October will be published by the same Editor,

THE WASPS of ARISTOPHANES.

John Murray, Albemarle-street.

Second Edition, revised, 18mo. price 1s. 6d. bound,

A MANUAL OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR, Philosophical and Practical, with Exercises; adapted to the Analytical Mode of Tuition. For the use of Schools or Private Students.

By the Rev. J. M. McCULLOCH, A.M. Minister of Kelso.

. The sale of a large impression in the short space of a few months, is the most gratifying proof of the general approbation with which this Manual has been received. In revising the Work for a second edition, the Author has been anxious to render it still more deserving of public favour. The suggestions which were communicated by many intelligent Teachers, have received his most attentive consideration; and several alterations have been made, which, he trusts, will better adapt it to the purposes of education. The definitions and rules intended to be committed to memory have been shortened, in order to accommodate them still more to the juvenile capacity; and various mode of expression which were considered too difficult for beginners, have been replaced by others of greater simplicity. No change, however, has been made either in the leading principles, or in the general arrangement of the Work; as the Author is happy to find that these have been warmly approved by the most experienced instructors of youth.

Printed for Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh; and Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. London.

Also by the same Author,

A SERIES of LESSONS in Prose and Verse, progressively arranged. Third Edition. 12mo. 2s. 6d. bound.

A COURSE of ELEMENTARY READING in SCIENCE and LITERATURE. Fifth Edition. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

In Five Volumes, (or Six Parts,) 8vo. price 5l. 12s. boards,

AN EXPOSITION of the PARABLES, and of other parts of the GOSPELS. In Two Parts. By EDWARD GRESWELL, B.D. Fellow of C. C. C. Oxford; and Author of the "Harmonia Evangelica" and of "Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels."

London: printed for J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Waterloo Plbce, Pall-mall; and J. H. Parker. Oxford.

Just published, demy 8vo. price 5s.

THE CHURCH'S SELF-REGULATING PRIVILEGE, a National Safeguard in respect of Real Church Reform; or Reasons for reviving Convocations, or restoring Provincial and Diocesan Synods.

By JOHN KEMPTHORNE, B.D. Rector of St. Michael's, Gloucester.

J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly, London; and Jew, Gloucester.

This day is published, price 6s. in a uniform size with Dr. Lardner's Cyclopædia, the Second Edition of the First Volume of

THE ARCHÆOLOGY of POPULAR PHRASES and NURSERY RHYMES. By J. BELLENDEN KER, Esq.

. Considerable additions have been made to this Volume, and the greatest portion of it has been re-written by the author.

Vol. II. is in the Press.

London: published by Messrs. Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman; and by J. Coupland, Southampton.

This day, in 8vo. 12s. boards, the Third Edition of

THE LIFE, and a **SELECTION** from the **LETTERS** of the late Rev. HENRY VENN, M.A., successively Vicar of Huddersfield, Yorkshire, and Rector of Yelling, Hants. Author of the "Complete Duty of Man." The Memoir of his Life, drawn up by the late Rev. JOHN VENN, M.A. Rector of Clapham, Surrey. Edited by the Rev. HENRY VENN, B.D. Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Holloway, Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.

London: J. Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly; of whom may be had

"**THE HISTORY of RUTH CLARK**," Thirty Years a Servant to the late Rev. H. Venn. Ninth Edition, 12mo. 6d. or 5s. per dozen.

The Young Pastor's Guide to the Practice of the Christian Ministry.

Just published, price 4s. 6d. sewed,

REV. T. DALE'S FIVE SERMONS, preached before the University of Cambridge in March, 1835, on Scripture "Profitable for Doctrine, Conviction, Correction, and Instruction in Righteousness."

Pelham Richardson, 23, Cornhill.

"They form a manual of practice which no youth aspiring to the sacred calling of a minister of Christ ought to be without."—*Old England*.

Of whom may be had, by the same Author,

SERMONS preached before the University in January, 1832, price 4s.; or the two bound in one volume, 8s. 6d.

THE PENNY SUNDAY READER.

THE FIRST VOLUME is just Published, neatly bound in cloth, with its appropriate Wood-cut on the Wrapper. Price 2s. 9d.

The Work is continued in Weekly Numbers.

Sold by Rivingtons, St. Paul's-church yard, and Waterloo Place, London, and all other booksellers.

Just published, in 8vo. price 7s.

LETTERS on the **PHILOSOPHY of UNBELIEF**.
By the Rev. JAMES WILLS.

Printed for B. Fellowes, Ludgate Street.

Just published, in 8vo. price 7s.

THE CHURCH-YARD STILE; being **TWELVE SERMONS** adapted to the **MECHANICAL and AGRICULTURAL POPULATION**.

By **EDWARD WILLIAM CLARKE**, Rector of Great Yeldham, Essex.

Printed for B. Fellowes, Ludgate Street.

This day is published, 12mo. 7s. 6d. boards.

TEN DISCOURSES on the **COMMUNION OFFICE** of the **CHURCH of ENGLAND**. With an Appendix. By the Rev. **ROBERT ANDERSON**, Perpetual Curate of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Hill, and the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth.

J. Hatchard and Son, London.

Of whom may be had, by the same, the Second Edition, 7s. 6d. bds.

A PRACTICAL EXPOSITION of ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE to the ROMANS.

THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA'S TWO CHARGES.

In a few days will be published, in 8vo.

TWO CHARGES delivered TO THE CLERGY in the DIOCESE OF CALCUTTA: the former at Calcutta the 13th August, at Colombo the 13th November, and at Madras the 23d December, 1834; and the latter to THE REV. MISSIONARIES at Tanjore, the 2d February, and at Vepery 21st February, 1835; AT THE PRIMARY VISITATION. By Dr. WILSON, DD. Bishop of Calcutta. London: Published by Stevens and Sons, 39, Bell Yard, Temple Bar, and may be had of all Booksellers; also the Bishops other works.

1. THE APOSTOLICAL COMMISSION. A Sermon delivered at the Cathedral Church of St. John, Calcutta, at an Ordination on Sunday, Jan. 6, 1833. Price 1s. 6d.

2. A SERMON delivered at St. Mary's, Islington, on Sunday, June 16, 1832, immediately before his departure for India; to which is prefixed a Farewell Address. Price 2s.

3. SERMONS on Various Subjects of Christian Doctrine and Practice. 6th Edition. 8vo. 12s. boards.

4. LECTURES on the Evidences of Christianity. Second Edition. 2 vols. small 8vo. Price 9s. cloth boards.

5. SEVEN SERMONS on the Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day. Second Edition. 2s. 6d.

6. A TOUR on the Continent in the Summer of 1823: in a Series of Letters. Fourth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s. boards.

OCTAVO PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

Record Board.

THE following is a correct List of the principal Octavo Volumes recently printed under the authority of His Majesty's Commissioners on the Public Records of the Kingdom, of which a few Copies remain.

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION to DOMESDAY BOOK, accompanied by Indexes of the Tenants in Chief, Under-Tenants, at the Time of the Survey, as well as of the Holders of Lands mentioned in DOMESDAY anterior to the formation of that Record, with an Abstract of the Population. 2 vols. 1833.

PROCEEDINGS and ORDINANCES of the PRIVY COUNCIL of ENGLAND. 10 Richard II. 1386, to 14 Henry VI. 1436. 4 vols. 1834 5. *Vols. 5 & 6 will be published in a few days.*

ROTULUS CANCELLARII, vel ANTIGRAPHUM MAGNI ROTULI PIPÆ, de tertio anno Regni Regis Johannis. 1833.

ROTULI SELECTI ad RES ANGLICAS et HIBERNICAS SPEC-TANTES, ex Archivis in Domo Capitulari Westmonasteriensi deprompti. 1834.

EXCERPTA e ROTULIS FINIUM in TURRI LONDINENSI ASSERVATIS, Henrico tertio Rege, A.D. 1216—1272. Vol. I, A.D. 1216—1246. 1835. *Vol. 2 is in the Press.*

ROTULI CURIÆ REGIS, from the Sixth Year of King Richard I. to the end of the First Year of King John. 2 vols. 1825.

ROTULI NORMANNIE in TURRI LONDINENSI ASSERVATI, Johanne et Henrico quinto Angliæ Regibus. Vol. I, de Annis 1200—1205, necnon de Anno 1117. 1835. *Vol. 2 is in the Press.*

MAGNUS ROTULUS PIPÆ, de anno tricesimo primo Regni Henrici Primi, quem plurimi hæcenus laudant pro Rotulo quinti anni Stephani Regis. 1833.

PEDES FINIUM, sive FINALES CONCORDIÆ in CURIA DOMINI REGIS, A.D. 1195—A.D. 1214. Vol. I. 1835. *Vol. 2 is in the Press.*

N.B. Some Copies of the ROTULI LITTERARUM CLAUSARUM, A.D. 1204—1224, folio, are still left; and it is expected that a small number of the ROTULI LITTERARUM PATENTIUM, A.D. 1201—1216, folio, just printed, and not wanted for distribution to Public Libraries, will be placed in our hands for sale.

PATERNOSTER ROW,
June, 1835.

BALDWIN & CARDOCK.

HAREWOOD'S DICTIONARY OF SPORTS.

In One handsome Volume, duodecimo, printed by Whittingham, and embellished with 152 Engravings, price 7s. 6d. in extra boards,

A **DICTIONARY of SPORTS; or COMPANION to the Field,** the Forest, and the River side; containing explanations of every term applicable to Racing, Shooting, Hunting, Fishing, Hawking, Archery, &c., with Essays upon all National Amusements.

By **HARRY HAREWOOD, Esq.** of Springfield, in the county of York.

London: printed for Thomas Tegg and Son, Cheapside; and may be procured, by order, from any bookseller in the United Kingdom.

THE FAMILY LIBRARY.

On Wednesday, the 1st of July, price 5s., embellished with Four Engravings, Vol. 52, of

THE FAMILY LIBRARY, being a Journal of the Plague Year; or, Memorials and Observations of the most Remarkable Occurrences, as well public as private, which happened in London during the Great Pestilence in 1665. By **DANIEL DEFOE.** A New Edition, revised and illustrated, with Historical Notes, by **E. W. BRAYLEY, F.S.A.**

London: Thomas Tegg and Son, Cheapside; and may be procured, by order, from any other Bookseller in the United Kingdom.—Vol. 53, with two Engravings, will be ready on the 1st of September.

In 8vo. price 1s.

NEUTRALITY in TIME of DANGER to the CHURCH, an **ABANDONMENT of the FAITH,** and very Short-sighted Worldly Policy; an Admonition to the Members of the Church of England, delivered in a Sermon at South Hackney Church, on Sunday April 5th, 1835.

By the Rev. **H. H. NORRIS, M.A.**

Rector of the said Parish, Prebendary of St. Paul's and Llandaff, and Chaplain to the Earl of Shaftesbury.

Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo Place; Cochran, Strand; Cock, Fleet-street; and Wix, New Bridge-street.

Just published, in 12mo. price 7s. 6d. boards,

TWENTY-ONE SERMONS, on Various Subjects, adapted to the Present Time.

By the Rev. **JACOB HENRY BROOKE MOUNTAIN, M.A.**

Prebendary of Lincoln, Rector of Blunham, Bedfordshire, Vicar of Hemel Hemstead, Herts, and Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester.

Printed for Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo Place; and sold by J. & J. J. Deighton, Cambridge.

Lately published by the same Author,

TWELVE SERMONS on ADVENT. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

The Fourth Edition. 8vo. price 8s. boards.

I **STRUCTIONS for the USE of CANDIDATES for HOLY ORDERS,** and of the Parochial Clergy, as to Ordination, Licenses, &c., with Acts of Parliament relating to the Residence of the Clergy and Maintenance of Curates, &c. &c. By **CHRISTOPHER HODGSON,** Secretary to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury,

Printed for J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

Lately published,

THE COVENANT of the DIVINE LAW INWARDLY ACCEPTED.

“This shall be the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts.”

Sold by Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall-Mall.

WRIGHT'S GREEK AND ENGLISH LEXICON.

In One Volume, uniform with Dymock's and Meadow's Dictionaries, price 7s. in canvas boards, or 7s. 6d. bound and lettered,

A GREEK and ENGLISH LEXICON, on a plan entirely new; in Four Parts, viz. Greek-English, difficult inflections, English-Greek, and proper Names, containing the interpretations of all the words which occur in Greek classic authors, the Septuagint, and New Testament; with the quantity of all the doubtful vowels, as far as it can be ascertained from the Poets; and an Introduction, comprising an explanation of the more important terminations. By M. WRIGHT.

London: Printed for Thomas Tegg and Son, Cheapside; R. Griffin and Co. Glasgow; also, Tegg, Wise, and Co. Dublin; and may be procured, by order, from any other bookseller in the United Kingdom.

Just published, price 10s. 6d. boards, the Third Volume of

COMMENTARIES on the AFFAIRS of the CHRISTIANS before the time of Constantine the Great; or an enlarged View of the Ecclesiastical History of the First Three Centuries, accompanied with copious illustrative Notes and References. Translated from the *Latin* of John Laurence Mosheim, D.D., late Chancellor of the University of Gottingen, by Robert Studley Vidal, Esq., F.S.A.

London: J.G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, of whom may be had,

The Two First Volumes of the same Work, price 1l. 1s. in boards.

SENIOR ON FOREIGN POOR-LAWS AND LABOURERS.

Just published, in 8vo. price 7s.

STATEMENT of the PROVISION for the POOR, and of the CONDITION of the LABOURING CLASSES, in a considerable Portion of America and Europe. By NASSAU W. SENIOR, Esq.; being the Preface to the Foreign Communications contained in the Appendix to the Poor Law Report.

B. Fellowes, Ludgate Street (Publisher to the Poor Law Commissioners).

In 12mo. price 7s. 6d. in boards, (with a Map of Ireland,) the Fourth Volume of

A HISTORY of ENGLAND, in which it is intended to consider Men and Events on Christian Principles.

By a CLERGYMAN of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

Printed for J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall-Mall.

Of whom may be had,

The First, Second, and Third Volumes, price 1l. in boards, or any single Number at 6d.

JULY, 1835.

WORKS

JUST READY FOR PUBLICATION

BY

J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, Pall Mall.

I.

SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY. SECOND SERIES.

By the Rev. R. W. EVANS, M.A.

Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Author of the *RECTORY OF VALEHEAD*.

Being the Twelfth Volume of the THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

With Frontispiece. 6s.

Lately Published, the FIRST SERIES. With Frontispiece. 6s.

II.

SOME ACCOUNT of the WRITINGS of CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA.

By the Right Rev. JOHN KAYE, D.D.

Lord Bishop of Lincoln.

8vo.

III.

A MANUAL OF PRIVATE DEVOTIONS.

By the Rev. CHARLES GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

Vicar of Sedgley, Staffordshire.

In small 8vo.

IV.

The SECOND EDITION of PAROCHIAL SERMONS.

By the Rev. JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, M.A.

Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, and Fellow of Oriel College.

8vo. 10s. 6d.

Lately Published, the SECOND VOLUME, (for the Festivals of the Church.)

8vo. 10s. 6d.

Preparing for the Press.

THE LIFE OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

By the Rev. CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A. Professor in the East India College, Herts; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In One Volume. *Portrait.* 6s.

Lately Published, by the same Author,

THE LIFE OF BISHOP JEWEL.

With Portrait. 6s.

CONTENTS

OF

N^o. XXXV.

PAGE.

ART. I. India, its State and Prospects. By Edw. Thornton, Esq.	1
II. Essay on Church Patronage; or a Brief Inquiry, on the ground of Scripture and Antiquity, into the People's right to choose their own Minister.	23
III. The Life of Bishop Jewel. By Charles Webb Le Bas, M.A.	38
IV. 1. Assemblée Générale de la Société Evangélique de Genève tenue le 30 Avril et le 1 ^{er} Mai, 1834, à l'Oratoire. (Troisième Anniversaire.)	
2. La Voix de l'Eglise une sous toutes les formes successives du Christianisme. Par J. H. Merle d'Aubigné.	53
V. 1. Speech of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., in the House of Commons, on Thursday, the 2nd of April, 1835.	
2. The Roman Catholic Oath considered. By Eneas Mac Donnell, Esq.	
3. Further Considerations of the Roman Catholic Oath, in a Letter to Edward Blount, Esq. late Secretary to the English Roman Catholic Association. By Eneas Mac Donnell, Esq.	74
VI. 1. The Causes of the Corruption of Christianity. By the Rev. Robert Vaughan, Professor of Ancient and Modern History in the University of London.	
2. Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical and Early Fathers. By William Osburn, Jun.	106
VII. 1. Songs of the Prophecies. By M. S. Milton.	
2. A Voice from the Dormitory: being a Collection of Sacred Poems, the Majority of which are from old Authors.	
3. Sacred Poetry. By a Layman.	135
VIII. 1. Episcopal and Clerical Duty and Responsibility considered in Reference to Ireland, in a letter respectfully addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, on his Lordship's Charge against the Established Church Home Mission. By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, A. B.	
2. The Divine Patience exhausted through the making void the Divine Law. A Sermon preached at Camden Chapel, Camberwell, on Sunday, 26th April, 1825. By Henry Melvill, A. M.	

3. The Established Church: Letters on the Voluntary Principle. By a Quiet Looker On.	
4. The Present Position of Church and State described; the Cause assigned; and the Remedy proposed. By a Clergyman of the Church of England.	141
IX. 1. Abstract Education Inquiry. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20th March, 1835.	
2. Resolutions respecting Education. Ordered to be printed by the House of Lords, 21st May, 1835.	
3. Speech of Henry Lord Brougham in the House of Lords on Thursday, May 21, 1835, on the Education of the People.	171
X. A Discourse of Natural Theology. By Henry Lord Brougham.	210
XI. 1. Letters on the Necessity of a National Church. By the Rev. Charles Cator.	
2. A National Church vindicated. Parts I. & II.	
3. The Church's Self-Regulating Privilege, a National Safe-guard in respect of real Church Reform; or, Reasons for reviving Convocations, or restoring Provincial and Diocesan Synods. By John Kemphorne, B. D.	
4. Twenty-one Sermons on Various Subjects, adapted to the Present Time. By the Rev. Jacob Henry Brook Mountain, M. A.	
5. Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions in the Promotion of Sound Religious Knowledge, occasioned by Lord Henley's Plan for their Abolition. By Edw. B. Pusey, B. D.	
6. Proposals for a Reformation of the Church of England, in a Letter to a Friend about to secede from that Communion.	
7. An Address to the Curates of the Church of England on the subject of Church Reform. By a Clergyman of the Establishment.	
8. Practical Hints on Church Reform. By a Churchman.	
9. A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell. By a Beneficed Clergyman of the Protestant Church of Ireland.	
10. Neutrality in Time of Danger to the Church, an Abandonment of the Faith, and very Short-sighted Worldly Policy; an Admonition to the Members of the Church of England, delivered in a Sermon at South Hackney Church, on Sunday April 5th, 1835. By the Rev. H. H. Norris, M. A.	224
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.	249

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

XXXIII C. 27. JULY, 1835.

ART. I.—*India, its State and Prospects.* By Edward Thornton, Esq. London: Parbury, Allen, & Co., Leadenhall-Street, 1835.

PERHAPS the whole history of the world can scarcely present to us a phenomenon more stupendous than our vast Asiatic dependency. Its distance, its magnitude, the strange anomalies of its government, all conspire to throw about it a sort of bewildering interest. It looks like a deviation from the ordinary course of Nature. It is, almost, as if a huge satellite should revolve about a central body, comparatively insignificant in mass and dimensions. Without previous knowledge or experience of such a state of things, any philosophic mind might be tempted to pronounce it a moral, nay, a physical, impossibility. And yet, in spite of all this, nothing can well be more astonishing than the habitual, and nearly universal apathy, with which this enormous department of our grand imperial system is, even at this day, regarded by the inhabitants of the British isles! For the most part, they know or care as little about it, as they know or care about what is passing in the regions of the Moon. They think of it, chiefly, as a place from which people always come back with sallow or mahogany countenances, and enlarged or schirrous livers. They consider the life of an Anglo-Indian as a long and very sultry vista, with Baker-Street, or Cheltenham Spa, at the termination of it. And there, generally speaking, is the beginning, the middle, and the end of their speculations about the matter. It may sometimes happen, indeed, in the cycle of political events, that the great Asiatic *interests* may approach so near to the orbit of our own domestic system, as to perplex monarchs, and statesmen, and people, with fear of ruinous disturbance in its movements. As an instance of this, we may refer to the tremendous agitation produced throughout the realm by Fox's celebrated India Bill. India was, at that period, regarded with

as much consternation, as if it were a vast political comet, which menaced our constitution with irretrievable derangement. But, with exceptions such as this, it seems to be well nigh blotted out from our whole scheme of thought. We hear of it, indeed, *periodically*, at intervals of one and twenty years. But even then, it excites, among the great mass of the English people, scarcely so much sensation as the appearance of the comets of Biela and of Enckè. And when that sensation is passed away, the whole affair plunges, once more, into the depths of oblivion. It is heard of no more, until the appointed legislative revolution brings it back again.

All this is very curious; and, in many respects, all this is extremely deplorable. It is deeply to be lamented, that matters of such prodigious magnitude, and such vital importance, should be condemned to almost utter exile from the minds and hearts of Englishmen; that a turnpike-bill, or a railroad-bill, or a bill for the reformation of *omnibuses*, should often command a more close and lively attention, than the happiness and peace of millions upon millions of our *fellow-subjects*; and that the deliberations of our legislature, touching these awful questions, might sometimes be suspended, if any honorable member should insist upon counting the house! But, we suppose the evil may, for a long time to come, remain well nigh incurable. At all events, we greatly doubt whether, at the present moment, the arrival of intelligence that the Muscovite was in full march for Delhi, would occasion one-hundredth part so much feverish curiosity among us, as the news of another *three glorious days* in the good city of Paris.

The eye of Commerce, it is true, has been, at all times, directed, with tolerable steadiness, towards the East. But then, Commerce has no eye but for the returns and the proceeds of capital. It has no eye for the condition of those living and breathing instruments, by which capital is made productive. What do the merchants of Liverpool and of Manchester care—what can they be supposed to care—about the good government of an immense population, at the distance of six months' sail from the shores of Britain,—otherwise, than as good government is essential to commercial prosperity? Provided that Free Trade spreads out a constantly increasing expanse of canvass to the tropical gales, what more can be desired by the functionary of the counting-house and the desk? And, again; provided that cotton and tea are supplied at a reasonable price, how can it be expected that the English consumer should embitter his enjoyment of those articles, by laborious speculations and inquiries, respecting the vast and complex agencies by which they are conveyed to the market? Notwithstanding, however, the natural

indifference of human beings, as to every thing remote, and the difficulty of procuring accurate information, the prevalent inertness of this country is more than can be fully accounted for, considering the length of time which has elapsed since our first establishment in the East. Up to a very recent period, the geography and history of India were *almost* as unknown as the geography and history of America, previously to the discoveries of Columbus. It was known, indeed, that, somewhere or other, on the coast of India, there were three great stations, called Presidencies. But beyond these, all was mystery and doubt. If a father was interrogated concerning the situation of his son, the reply was, that he was "either at Madras, or *up the country*." Of the vast space which lies between Calcutta and Bombay, Cape Comorin and Delhi, little was ever heard. Let a man be on whatever spot he might, within that enormous extent, he was, always, "*up the country*." As for the inhabitants *up the country*, it was ascertained that they were *blacks*. It could, therefore, scarcely be doubtful, that they were savages; and, if so, it was highly probable that their chief occupation was massacre and pillage. It did happen, however, by some means or other, that Europeans returned, occasionally, from this land of barbarians and plunderers, with affluent, and sometimes with splendid fortunes. It was, moreover, certain that noble *argosies* were annually entering our ports from the same ill-civilized regions; and that *rupees* became, at length, as familiar as guineas to our commercial arithmetic. And, this being the case, all further curiosity was, for the most part, regarded as idle and superfluous.

It is gratifying to know that a number of powerful and enlightened minds have, for many years past, been zealously at work to deprive our countrymen of all apology for their continuance in a state of discreditable ignorance and apathy, respecting this great source of imperial grandeur and prosperity. And the effect has been, that the clouds and darkness, which once hid the prospect from us, have been gradually rolling away. The scene, thus distinctly revealed, may have been somewhat divested of its barbaric grandeur, and of its power over the imagination. But the spectacle is, nevertheless, one of great variety and magnificence. We have before us a prodigious expanse of country, rich in the productions of nature and of art, containing a population of upwards of one hundred millions, a large portion of which has, from the remotest ages, been in a high, though very peculiar, state of civilization; and the whole of which is now under the positive dominion, or the acknowledged influence, of Great Britain. The geography of that country is, at present, nearly as well settled as that of any portion of the globe. In the

great and useful labour by which this knowledge was acquired, Rennel took the lead. And this mighty pioneer has been followed, in the same course, by M'Kenzie, and Lambton, and Tod, and many other honorable names. To their scientific exertions we owe it, that every village, every stream, and almost every hillock, is as correctly noted down in our charts of the "Great Peninsula," as are the capital cities in a map of Europe. The distances, from town to town, have been ascertained by actual measurement; so that, at this time, the most ignorant old woman in the remotest corner of the empire, would no longer have an excuse for her credulity, if she were to believe the assertion, (once actually made by a very ignorant, or very unscrupulous narrator,) that any person might breakfast at Calcutta, dine at Madras, and sup at Bombay, in the course of one and the same day.

In former days, the literary part of our community complained, with too much justice, that our materials for building up any correct judgment as to Indian affairs, were confined to a few translations, from the works of native writers, and to compilations formed by men who were resident in Europe. Details obtained from actual observation there were none, or next to none. Multitudes of able men were constantly returning from the East, where the best years of their life had been passed in situations, which must have qualified them to speak, with perfect mastery, on all that related to our Oriental interests. But few, if any, of these had given the result of their observation and inquiry to the world. But how nobly has this reproach been now wiped away! To mention no other instances of our wealth, in this department of literature,—we have now Wilkes's History of the Mysore, and the South of India,—Malcolm's Central India,—Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas,—Stewart's Bengal,—and, lastly, the two splendid volumes of that most estimable and amiable man, Colonel Tod, which furnish a complete history of the Western States of Rajpootan.

In short, it seems, at last, to be felt, that the intelligence of England, may, at least without unworthy condescension, occupy itself with the interests, and the habits, and the characters, of the swarthy millions who constitute so large a portion of our imperial strength. To this hour, indeed, they excite but little of a sustained emotion of curiosity, among the generality of the reading and inquiring portion of our society. But still we would gladly believe that there is a progressive improvement in our habits of thought respecting the inhabitants of the "Great Peninsula." To accelerate that improvement is a task well worthy of all the ability and all the application that can be bestowed upon it. And by this conviction, we presume, it is, that Mr. Thornton has

been prompted to offer his contingent towards the accomplishment of an object so desirable. And the same conviction, too, has prompted us to seize the occasion, presented by his volume, of submitting some reflections to the public, relative to certain matters of no ordinary importance, connected with this great subject. A work entitled "*India, its State and Prospects*" must, of course, contain various topics, which fall strictly within the province of a journal, devoted chiefly to the cause of morals and religion.

Mr. Thornton has the pen of a *ready* writer: at times, we fear, somewhat too ready for the patience, the caution, and the impartiality, which the matter before him so urgently demands. His publication, by its very nature, is merely a synopsis. But, on that very account, it required, for its effective execution, the most laborious and watchful exercise of judgment. The errors of compendious works are the more dangerous, because they are concentrated, and undiluted. In saying this, we have no intention to withhold from the author the praise of patient industry, in the task of concentrating and condensing a vast mass of important information. But still we must confess, that there are certain portions of his volume, which scarcely indicate a due sense of the difficulty of his work; and in which we have sought, in vain, for marks of that quality of mind, which not only "looks before and after," but which, also, looks both to the right hand and to the left.

In total disregard of the order of his chapters, we fix at once upon that portion of the book which relates to the moral and religious state of India. And here, we were deeply struck with the absence of that spirit of equity and discrimination which ought, more especially, to preside over the inquiries of every one who undertakes to furnish the world with an exhibition of national character. Mr. Thornton, we regret to find, speaks, throughout, almost as if he were the retained advocate of the enemies and despisers of the natives of Hindostan. He has stated much that is, unhappily, most true; but the truth which he *has* disclosed seems to have been selected, with almost scrupulous care, with a view to the destruction of every hope of the moral capabilities of our Asiatic fellow subjects. He had a vast amount of various information before him. But nearly the whole of what he has produced, has little other tendency, than to fix the public mind of England, for ever, in a temper of disgust and contempt for the moral condition of the Hindoos, and nearly of utter despair as to any prospect of its improvement. He has told us all that he could collect of their disregard for veracity—their want of common integrity—their profound indifference as to

the imputation of perjury—their indulgence in malevolent passion—their incurable fondness for the odious luxury of litigation—their entire destitution of all public spirit or patriotic feeling—their heartless insensibility—their impurity of conversation—and their licentiousness of manners. And many of these charges, it must be conceded, he has supported by a mass of testimony so overpowering, that it might seem worse than idle to attempt any resistance to it. But then, on the other hand, it happens, most unfortunately, that, while he has marshalled this black array of evidence against the natives, he has almost, if not altogether, omitted an equal amount of cheering attestation, [to their advantage. Now, as the administration of Indian affairs, in their most momentous departments, is entrusted to functionaries taken from the mass of English society, we do hold it to be a matter of unspeakable importance, that the mass of English society should be thoroughly pervaded and penetrated by righteous and charitable sentiments upon this subject. It is most desirable that every man, woman, and child in Britain should be taught to form a just estimate of the hundred millions of human beings, with the good government of whom their own welfare is so closely and essentially bound up. And good government there cannot be, if the character of the governed be not fairly and honestly appreciated. For these reasons we shall endeavour to supply this crying defect in Mr. Thornton's exposition. He has produced *his* evidence. We shall now produce *ours*—which might, indeed, have easily been *his*, had he been as much alive, as could be desired, to the perilous consequences of imperfect or partial representation.

We begin with the testimony of Bishop Heber, who is produced by Mr. Thornton to show that the Hindoos are inhospitable, ungenerous, and inhuman. And, for this purpose, a passage is cited from the Bishop's journal, in which it is alleged that, if a traveller falls sick upon a journey, he is always suffered to perish by inches, or to be devoured by the jackals, and perhaps to be pelted with stones and mud, by children, in his last agonies. And this is followed up by the story of an unhappy wretch who had crept into a court-yard, while suffering from dysentery, and remained there two days and nights unnoticed and unaided by the domestics of the house. (*Thornton*, pp. 130, 132). But, while he was extracting these damnatory statements, how happens it that his eye did not wander onward to the next page? He would have found there some pleasing lights, to relieve the darkness of the foregoing picture: "What I would chiefly urge," continues the Bishop, "is, that, for all these horrors, their system of religion is mainly answerable; inasmuch, as whatever moral lessons their sacred books contain,—and they are very few,—are

“ shut up from the mass of the people ; while the direct tendency
 “ of their institutions is to evil. *The national temper is decidedly*
 “ *good, gentle, and kind. They are sober, industrious, affectionate*
 “ *to their relations ; generally speaking, faithful to their masters ;*
 “ *easily attached by kindness and confidence ; and, in the case of*
 “ *the military oath, are of admirable obedience, courage, and*
 “ *fidelity, in life and death.*” (Heb. Journ. vol. ii. p. 315.)

Much to the same effect is another testimony offered by this heavenly-minded servant of God : “ Of the people, so far as their
 “ *natural character is concerned, I have been led to form the most*
 “ *favourable opinion. They have, unhappily, many of the vices*
 “ *arising from slavery, from an unsettled state of society, and*
 “ *immoral and erroneous systems of religion. But they are men*
 “ *of high and gallant courage ; courteous, intelligent, and most*
 “ *eager after knowledge and improvement ; with a remarkable*
 “ *aptitude for the abstract sciences, geometry, astronomy, &c.,*
 “ *and for the imitative arts, painting and sculpture. They are*
 “ *sober, industrious, dutiful to their parents, and affectionate to*
 “ *their children ; of tempers almost uniformly gentle and patient ;*
 “ *and more easily affected by kindness, and attention to their wants*
 “ *and feelings, than almost any men whom I have met with.*
 “ Their faults seem to arise from the hateful superstitions to
 “ which they are subject, and the unfavourable state of society in
 “ which they are placed. *But, if it should please God to make*
 “ *any considerable portion of them Christians, they would, I can*
 “ *well believe, put the best of European Christians to shame.*”
 (Heb. Journ. vol. ii. p. 369.)

Once more : “ In the way, at Futtehgunge, I passed the tents
 “ of a large party, which were to return to Cawnpore the next
 “ day : and I was much pleased and gratified by the Soubahdar,
 “ and the greater part of the Sepoys of my old escort, running
 “ into the middle of the road, to bid me another farewell, and
 “ again to express their regret that they were not going with me ‘ to
 “ the world’s end.’ *They who talk of the ingratitude of the Indian*
 “ *character, should, I think, pay a little more attention to cases of*
 “ *this sort. These men neither got, or expected, any thing by*
 “ *this little expression of goodwill. If I had offered them money,*
 “ *they would have been bound, by the rules of the service, and*
 “ *their own dignity, not to take it. Sufficient civility and respect*
 “ *would have been paid, if any of them, who happened to be*
 “ *near the road, had touched their caps ; and I really can suppose*
 “ *them to have been actuated by no motive but goodwill. It*
 “ *had not been excited, so far as I know, by any particular desert,*
 “ *on my part. But I had always spoken to them civilly ; had*
 “ *paid some attention to their comforts, in securing them tents, fire-*

“wood, and camels for their knapsacks, and had ordered them a dinner, after their own fashion, on their arrival at Lucknow, at the expense of, I believe, not more than four rupees! Surely, if goodwill is to be bought by this sort of attention, it is a pity that any body should neglect them.” (*Heb. Journ.* vol. i. p. 411.)

The next witness we have to call is Sir Thomas Munro—an illustrious and venerable name, in the history of British India! The words of his, which we shall produce, will be few: but they form, in truth, the text upon which his whole public life was one continued commentary. He is speaking, in a minute of council,* of the various duties which a civil servant may have to discharge, and he expresses himself thus: “His communications, with them, (the natives) are not limited to one subject, but extend to every thing connected with the welfare of the country. He sees them engaged in the pursuits of trade and agriculture, and promoting, by their labours, the increase of its resources,—the object to which his own are directed. He sees that among them there is, as in other nations, a mixture of good and bad; that, *though many are selfish, many likewise, especially among the agricultural classes, are liberal and friendly to their poorer neighbours and tenants*: and he gradually learns to take an interest in their welfare, which adheres to him in every future situation.” (*Gleig’s Life of Munro*, vol. ii. pp. 16, 17.)

And now let us hear Sir John Malcolm,—the heroic soldier, and the enlightened administrator. In his instructions to the officers acting under his orders, in Central India, in 1821, he says—“The first, and one of the most important points, is the manner of European superiors towards the natives. It would be quite out of place, in this paper, to speak of the necessity of kindness, and the absence of all violence. This must be a matter of course, to all to whom it is addressed. There is much more required from them, than that conciliation which is a duty; but which, when it appears as such, loses half its effect. It must, to make an impression, be a habit of the mind, *grounded on a favourable consideration of the qualities and merits of those to whom it extends*. And this impression, I am satisfied, every person will have, who, (after attaining a thorough knowledge of the real character of those with whom he has intercourse), shall judge them, without prejudice or self-conceit, by a standard which is suited to their belief, their usages, their habits, their occupations, their rank in life, the ideas they have imbibed from infancy, and the stage of civilization to which the community, as a whole, are advanced. . . .

* August, 1820. *Gleig’s Life of Munro*.

“ Many of the moral defects of the natives of India are to be referred to that misrule and oppression, from which they are now, in a great degree, emancipated. *I do not know the example of any great population, in similar circumstances, preserving, through such a period of change and tyrannical rule, so much of virtue, or so many good qualities, as are to be found in a great proportion of the inhabitants of this country.* This is to be accounted for, in some degree, by the Hindu institutions, particularly that of *caste*; which appear to have raised them to their present rank in human society, at a very remote period. But these have, certainly, tended to keep them stationary at that point of civil order to which they were thus early advanced. With a just admiration of the effects of many of their institutions,—(particularly those parts of them which cause, in vast classes, not merely an absence of the common vices of theft, drunkenness, and violence, but preserve the virtuous ties of family and kindred relations),—we must all deplore some of their usages as weak and superstitious. But what individuals, or what races of men, are without great and manifold errors and imperfections? *And what mind, that is not fortified with ignorance and pride, can, on such grounds, come to a severe judgment against a people like that of India?*” (*Malcolm’s Political History of India*, vol. ii. Appendix, pp. cclxvii. cclxix.)

Not to heap up more authorities, we shall conclude with the sentiments of Colonel Tod;* who speaks, not merely with warmth, but with ardent enthusiasm, of the virtuous, the noble, and the high-minded men, with whom a long course of residence in India made him familiar. Nothing can exceed the affection and the admiration which burst forth from him, when speaking of the brave and magnanimous Rajpoot—of his heroic daring in the field—of his devoted allegiance to his sovereign—of his utter oblivion of self, when the cause of his country demanded the strength of his arm, and the outpouring of his life-blood. From his youth, this amiable and noble-minded man lived among these gallant spirits: and he was loved and venerated by them as their friend and guide,—as their protector and their father. And it is impossible to rise from a perusal of the pages which he has devoted to the commemoration of their worth, without feeling as if the brightest gems of European chivalry might almost lose their lustre, in the comparison with these, the mirrors of Asiatic *knighthood*.

So much for the testimony of honourable men, who have generously recorded, from their own personal knowledge and expe-

* In his splendid work on Rajpootan.

rience, a gladdening testimony to the *natural* aptitude of the Hindoo for all those excellences which can exalt and dignify humanity. We may now be permitted to select a single instance from the vast group we have been surveying. A gentleman well known to us, (who resided for many years in the southern parts of India, where he occupied an official station of importance), had in his office two native writers. One of these was a Brahmin: the other a Christian; by birth, of a lower, though still of a reputable, caste. The Brahmin was exemplary in the practice of all the moral and social duties, in a degree which might make many a professing Christian almost hide his head. His affection for his family and relatives was beautiful. And this was shown not merely in the shape of barren sentiment. His sensibilities were manifested in a more substantial form: for, though his means were not abundant, he shared them, most cheerfully and most liberally, with those of his kindred who were in indigence. The Christian, too, was one who adorned the Gospel by his life and conversation; and, it is worthy of remark, that the prejudices of the Brahmin were not proof against the impression of his worth; for the two walked together as familiar friends and brethren. Of the affectionate and grateful temper of these men, we ourselves can speak; for we have been allowed to peruse some parts of their correspondence with the gentleman in question. From him they had received much kindness, during his residence in India. And this they were never weary of acknowledging, after he had departed, and they were, probably, to see his face no more. We believe a twelvemonth never passed without bringing him a letter from one of them,—nearly always containing a postscript from the other: and their language to their friend and benefactor does honour to the human heart. The Christian is now deceased. The Brahmin still survives,—a living evidence that there are Gentiles who can render obedience,—we would humbly hope an *acceptable* obedience,—to the law written on their hearts. But this, it may be said, is a solitary picture! We are unable, it is true, to produce companions to it. But we have very little doubt that it might be multiplied, to an extent that would rejoice the spirit of every man with a spark of genuine philanthropy in his bosom.

We can easily anticipate what Mr. Thornton will say to all this. He will ask, where can be the danger or the wrong of telling the whole truth, and setting forth, in its full length, and breadth, and depth, “the depravity of heart and prostration of mind which have “sunk a great people into wretchedness, and rendered them the “objects of political contempt and moral abhorrence.” Where can be the mischief of this; *provided always* that these giant evils be

traced to their true parentage? And have I not, he will say, given their pedigree correctly? Have I not pointed out the atrocious and extravagant Superstition of the country, as the fruitful Mother of this hell-brood? And have I not distinctly stated that Slavery has been the Nurse of the same odious progeny, and has carefully nourished them up to their present perfection of deformity? And if this *should* be his answer, we should still reiterate our protest and our complaint. We should still complain that his statements are so unmitigated and unrelieved, that most readers would rise from the contemplation of them, with the impression that the vices of the *Mother*, and the pernicious cares of the *Nurse*, had, *irretrievably*, done their very worst upon the land, and left upon it no one trace of moral comeliness, no one element of mental health or strength. We should, still, never cease to protest against a fiercely-coloured emblazonment of all the obliquities and distortions of any national Body, unqualified by an exhibition of those lines of beauty, and those indications of vigour, which still remain, and upon which the eye of benevolence and wisdom has so often rested with complacency and hope. The Hindoos are dreadfully depraved: so says Mr. Thornton; and so have many able and sagacious observers said before him. But the Hindoos are still distinguished by numerous marks, which indicate an inherent natural capacity for moral excellence: so say the Munros, and the Malcolms, and the Tods, and the Hebers. But so has *not* Mr. Thornton said. And here lies the burden of our complaint against him. We contend that there is neither charity, nor righteousness, nor prudence, in this partial style of delineation. It virtually makes truth do the work of slander. Its immediate tendency is to extinguish hope—and, with hope, all active good-will,—in the hearts of those who are to govern. Its remoter effect is to aggravate, and to render perpetual, the degradation and the misery of those who are to be governed.

It may here, perhaps, be asked—if there still remain in the breast of the Hindu these hopeful rudiments of goodness, how happens it that they have not burst forth into more vigorous development, since the subversion of the Mussulman dominion, and the establishment of European supremacy? Alas! alas! a full and honest answer to this question would amount, we grievously fear, to a most formidable impeachment of European policy and virtue! We have imported the *name* of Christianity among them. We say the *name*; for, during a long and disgraceful period, it scarcely can be said that we had imported even the *form* of Christianity. And, as for its *spirit*, who does not know the confession which was wrung from the heart of Schwartz, and other pious men,—namely, that the lives of Chris-

tians have too often made the Gospel to be little better than “*an astonishment, and a hissing, and a curse*, among idolaters.” Who does not remember the exclamation of our first Protestant bishop (Middleton),—“We shall do nothing, until we have *christianized* the Christians!” But let us pass onward from these afflicting recollections? Let us come to matters of purely secular interest. And, herein, what can we do better than listen, patiently and calmly, to the allegations of one of our own most distinguished functionaries. “The main evil of our system,” says Sir Thomas Munro, “is the degraded state in which we hold the natives. We “suppose them to be superstitious, ignorant, prone to falsehood, “and corrupt. In our well-meaning zeal for their welfare, we “shudder at the idea of committing to men so depraved, any “share in the administration of their own country. We never “consider that their superstition has little or no influence on “their public conduct; that individuals, and even whole nations, “the most superstitious and credulous in supernatural concerns, “may be as wary and sceptical in the affairs of the world as any “philosopher can desire. We exclude them from every situation “of trust and emolument. We confine them to the lowest offices, “with scarcely a bare subsistence: and even these are left in “their hands from necessity, because Europeans are incapable of “filling them. We treat them as an inferior race of beings. “Men, who, under a native government, might have held the “first dignities of the state,—who, but for us, might have “been governors of provinces—are regarded as little better than “menial servants; are often no better paid; and scarcely are “permitted to sit down in our presence! We reduce them to “this abject state; and then look down upon them with disdain, as “men unworthy of high station. Under most of the Mahomedan “princes of India, the Hindoos were eligible to all the offices of “civil government; and they frequently possessed a more im- “portant share in them than the conquerors.” (*Life of Munro*, vol. ii. p. 258.) Again, “I always dread changes at the “head of the India Board; for I fear that some downright “Englishman may, at last, get there, who will insist on making “Anglo-Saxons of the Hindoos! I have no faith in “the modern doctrine of the rapid improvement of the Hin- “doos, or of any other people. The character of the Hindoos “is, probably, much the same as when Vasco de Gama first “visited India; and it is not likely that it will be much better “a century hence. The strength of our government will, no “doubt, in that period, by preventing the wars so frequent in “former times, increase the wealth and population of the country. “We shall also, by the establishment of schools, extend among

“ the Hindoos the knowledge of their own literature, and of the
 “ language and literature of England. But all this will not im-
 “ prove their character. We shall make them more pliant and
 “ servile, more industrious, and perhaps more skilful in the arts,
 “ and we shall have fewer banditti. But we shall not raise their
 “ moral character. *Our present system of government, by ex-*
 “ *cluding all natives from power, and trust, and emolument, is*
 “ *much more efficacious in depressing, than all that our laws and*
 “ *school-books can do in elevating their character.* We are work-
 “ ing against our own desigus; and we can expect to make no
 “ progress, while we work with a feeble instrument to improve,
 “ and a powerful one to deteriorate. *The improvement of the*
 “ *character of a people, and the keeping them, at the same time, in*
 “ *the lowest state of dependence on foreign rulers, to which they*
 “ *can be reduced by conquest, are matters quite incompatible with*
 “ *each other.* While the prospects of the natives are so
 “ bounded, every project for bettering their character must
 “ fail. And no such projects can have the smallest chance of
 “ success, unless some of those objects are placed within their
 “ reach, for the sake of which men are urged to exertion in other
 “ countries. *This work of improvement, in whatever way it may*
 “ *be attempted, must be very slow. But it will be in proportion*
 “ *to the degree of confidence which we repose in them, in the ad-*
 “ *ministration of public affairs. All that we can give them, with-*
 “ *out endangering our ascendancy, should be given. All real*
 “ *military power should be kept in our own hands. But they*
 “ *might, with advantage hereafter, be made eligible to every civil*
 “ *office, under that of a member of the government. The change*
 “ *should be gradual, because they are not yet fit to discharge pro-*
 “ *perly the duties of a high civil employment, according to our*
 “ *rules and ideas. But the sphere of their employment should be*
 “ *extended in proportion as we find that they become capable of*
 “ *filling properly high situations.*” (*Ibid.* p. 59.)

It would be insufferably presumptuous and absurd in us, who never set foot in India, and scarcely ever beheld one of her sons, except here and there a straggling Lascar—to offer a syllable of suggestion as to the limitations under which the views above contended for, may be safely applied. And our difficulty is much aggravated by a recollection of the evidence produced before the Parliamentary Committee on the last India Bill. The question was, then, anxiously and repeatedly asked—“ Are the
 “ natives of India fit to be trusted in posts of serious responsi-
 “ bility?” And, in substance, the answer almost universally rendered, was, “ O yes!—quite fit to be trusted—provided there is
 “ an European to overlook them!” This reply, (so far as we

have examined, at least, and we examined a good deal,) was given by men, whose opinions, on other matters, were as various as might be expected, relative to questions of vast complexity and extent. And, if this answer be correct, the point arises,—how are the European governors to begin with the application of the principle maintained by Sir Thomas Munro, and now partially recognized by the British Legislature? But, whatever may be the difficulty or the hazard, it is quite clear that the experiment must be made. There must be a decision of the question—whether or not, the people of Hindostan are *incurably* debased; whether ages have irrevocably completed the work which the early day of slavery proverbially commences; whether the loss of half their virtue, in the beginnings of their history, has been followed, in the course of time, by the destruction of every remaining fragment of it. Many a generation will, probably pass away, before this great problem is brought to its solution. But, for our parts, we have good hope. We cannot persuade ourselves that the tyranny of past ages has so trodden down the seeds of integrity, throughout the length and breadth of a mighty land, that they shall never spring up and flourish. The process, as Munro allows, must be gradual. It will require a rare combination of caution, patience, and benevolence, to bring it to a prosperous issue. But, if the experiment be carried on, with an eye to the God of all the families of the earth, it would be something like impiety to doubt of its eventual success.

Intimately, and very obviously, connected with the subject of morals and religion, is the education of officers for the civil and military service of India. On this matter, Mr. Thornton expresses himself with an easy confidence, which is but ill-suited to a question of measureless importance, and of no ordinary difficulty. In speaking of the East India College, (which has now existed for nearly thirty years, and which was instituted for the preparation of the civil servants) he represents it as “somewhat extraordinary that, in these reforming times, the college should have “been spared, as its necessity is by no means apparent.” And he adds, “whether there ever existed any necessity for the college, “may admit of doubt. But it is *quite clear* that it is not adapted “to the altered circumstances of the Company. It seems probable that, in future, the average number of students will “not greatly exceed that of the professors, and assistant professors. And, to maintain such a magnificent establishment for “so inadequate a purpose, is only to excite ridicule, or a graver, “though not more friendly feeling.” Now, as to what may be the future average in the number of students, we are without the

means of knowledge, or any sure grounds of conjecture. But an inspection of the East India Register has informed us, as it might have informed Mr. Thornton, that the number of professors, and assistant professors, even including the Principal of the college, never exceeded twelve: and less than this, is scarcely compatible with the variety of studies embraced by the system. If Mr. Thornton was not aware of this, his statement is chargeable with very culpable negligence. If he *did* know it—how are we to understand him? Does he mean to affirm that the number of the students is ever likely to dwindle down to little more than a dozen? And, if so, what are the grounds for this assertion? We happen to know, that the present number, though much less than that for which the building was intended, exhibits no approximation to any such reduction. We know, too, that the diminution of numbers, which has actually taken place of late years, is not to be wholly, or principally, ascribed to the reduced demands of the civil service; but rather to a departure from the original plan of the establishment. When the college was instituted, every student was bound to a residence of two years, before he could receive his appointment to India. But, in 1826, it was thought that this system failed to supply the service with adequate rapidity. An act of parliament was, accordingly, obtained, enabling any student to leave the college, *as soon as he should have completed his eighteenth year*,—(the earliest age at which a civil appointment can be given)—provided that he could qualify himself to the satisfaction of the College Council; that is, of the Principal and professors. The result of this has been, that young men now, pretty generally, are not sent to the college till the age of seventeen and upwards; by which practice their parents may, possibly, be spared, and very frequently are spared, the expense of a residence beyond a single year. Whether this alteration were necessary, or expedient, or beneficial, we shall not take upon ourselves to pronounce. Thus much, however, we may venture to submit,—that, upon the face of it, its tendency must be to mutilate, most grievously, the efficacy and usefulness of the institution. Two years, most assuredly, is not too long a period of preparation, for men who are destined for the civil service, in all its important and arduous departments. Neither is it possible to see, without pain, many a promising youth swept away from the Institution, after a single twelvemonth's residence, and just at the moment when he is beginning to benefit most deeply by the ample means of instruction which it affords. But, be this as it may, the effect of the change we have described, in thinning the college, is perfectly manifest. If the original plan had not been thus broken down, there would have been far less reason to complain of the

alleged disproportion between the number of professors and the number of students under their care : a disproportion, however, of which the vague statements of Mr. Thornton are calculated to convey a very exaggerated impression.

Whether it may be proper to abolish this establishment, on the ground of its expense, and to provide some cheaper security for the due qualification of the civil servants,—is a question upon which we scarcely feel ourselves competent to enter. One thing, however, is manifest ;—namely, that if it be abolished, the same act of parliament which removes it, must contain the enactment of something or other to be substituted in its place. In that case, Mr. Thornton very quietly assures us, “the most *simple* course will be the most efficient. Let the candidates be required to possess a certain degree of knowledge in such branches of literature and science as may be deemed necessary; their proficiency to be, of course, ascertained by examination.” The *simplicity* of this expedient is, doubtless, at first sight, exceedingly captivating. But a little reflection may raise some reasonable misgivings, respecting the permanent efficacy of the plan. Mr. Thornton does not seem to be aware, that it is the very nature of all boards of examination to sink gradually downward to the lowest possible scale of exaction. And the reason is obvious : it is the very nature of all successive classes of *examinees* to tend more and more towards mediocrity of attainment : and it is too much to expect of the successive boards of inquisitors, that they should be gifted with firmness to resist this tendency. At a college, the tendency in question is greatly counteracted by the power of emulation, and the stimulus of periodical examinations, and honorary rewards ; the effect of which is, to bring out, at all times, much more than an average amount of talent and acquirement. But this excitement is wholly wanting, where young men, who are strangers to each other, meet, for the first time, in an examination room. Under such circumstances, they are very apt to take their chance, and to hope that they may do as well, or better, than others, of whom they can know nothing. And when the influx of mediocrity becomes, (as it is almost sure to do), nearly overpowering, the task of rejection becomes exceedingly painful and invidious ; and, in some cases, may be next to impossible. There is, consequently, the greatest danger lest such expedients should, in a short time, end in the disappointment of all,—except the individuals who may profit by the failure of the scheme !

In the Committee of the House of Commons, 1832, a suggestion was thrown out, that it might be advisable to make the whole service *originally* military ; and to select, for civil appointments,

the most intelligent and distinguished officers from the military Body. This scheme is condemned, without ceremony, by Mr. Thornton. "In this country"—he reminds us—"civil office is sometimes held by military men. But their military character is accidental." And he adds,—“we do not require those destined to diplomatic, financial, or judicial service, to prepare themselves *by a series of campaigns*. And why this should be advisable in India, no valid reason can be assigned.” On the merits of the proposal, thus contemptuously *sentenced* by Mr. Thornton, it is scarcely to be expected that we should be able to pronounce any intelligent opinion. Of one thing, however, we are quite certain—that the reason above assigned for its rejection, is absolutely good for nothing. Who ever imagined that a *series of campaigns* was a necessary preparation for civil office? A military man may pass a long, an honourable, and a useful professional life, without ever witnessing a skirmish. He may exhibit talents and endowments which are eminently valuable, in all situations which call for promptitude, despatch, and system. He may show a singular aptitude for winning the confidence and affections of the natives. He may prove himself master of that peculiar *tact*, which is so inestimable in the intercourse of Europeans with Hindoos. And it might easily be shown that the military profession is, in many respects, peculiarly favourable to the cultivation of those habits and faculties, which the anomalies of our position in India so frequently demand. Sir Thomas Munro bore a most distinguished share in all the conflicts between our troops, and those of Hyder and of Tippe, from 1780 to 1783. But does any one suppose that it was merely in consequence of his martial achievements, that he was selected to superintend the affairs of Canara, and the ceded districts; some years after, to fill the important office of chief commissioner for the revision of the *judicial system*; and, in the end, to be governor of Madras? His early military education had taught him regularity, and expedition, and energy, in the management of business: and these, when combined with his commanding talent, and his ardent devotion to the welfare of the natives, placed him among the most effective functionaries of the age; and earned for him, from the lips of Canning, the splendid praise, that “Europe never produced a more accomplished statesman, nor India, so fertile in heroes, a more skilful soldier.”* And, be it always recollected, that although, by education and profession, a soldier, Munro was not *prepared for civil office by a series of campaigns*. On the contrary, as observed by Canning, “his occupations had, for some years, been rather of a civil and administrative character; but

* Gleig's Life of Munro, vol. i. p. 505.

“ that he was called, early in the war, to exercise abilities, which, though dormant, had not rusted from disuse.” It was the combination of civil and military training with great natural capacities, which rendered, not only Munro, but Malcolm, and Wilks, and Blackburne, and other distinguished men, conspicuously fit for the most arduous civil stations under the government of India. If, then, the military service has produced such men as these,—and this, at a time when absolutely nothing was done to *insure* a previous education,—what might we not expect, if every cadet in the whole army should be required to undergo a liberal and extended course of study?

We repeat, however, that we are in no condition to form an enlightened judgment as to the expediency of adopting the system in question, and of abolishing all *original* distinction between the civil and military departments of service. There may be a multitude of objections to it, which our knowledge and experience are not sufficient to detect. There is, indeed, one probable effect of such a change, which must be obvious to all. The army, it must be kept in mind, is the main pillar of our security in India. The constant and visible exhibition of force is, there, absolutely requisite, to second the most powerful influences of opinion. At present, there is no army in the world provided with better officers, than that of India. But if there should be a perpetual drain upon its intelligence and ability, from the demands of the civil service, it is possible that the exhaustion might, in time, be fatal to its efficiency. And, in that case, we should deplore, with a late repentance, the scheme of merging the civil in the military education.

We shall conclude our remarks on this very momentous topic, with two observations. If the scheme last mentioned should ever be adopted, it might involve the necessity of an extended provision for the education of the *Civico-Military* students. And, if so, the abolition of the Civil College would by no means be attended with a commensurate saving of expense. If that scheme, however, should be thought inadmissible, we should greatly deprecate a hasty destruction of the Civil College, merely with a view to the saving of some thousands per annum. In spite of all that we occasionally hear to the contrary, we have opportunities of *knowing* that, in the way of discipline, this establishment accomplishes very much more than, under all circumstances, *can* possibly be accomplished by the universities of the land; and that its system calls forth an amount of industry, acquirement, and ability, of which the most favoured institution might reasonably be proud. A board of examiners would, undoubtedly, be

much cheaper. But we apprehend that the adoption of it would prove, in the end, a very costly exercise of frugality!

We had intended to present the reader with some interesting extracts from this volume, respecting a subject which has occasioned much controversy in India,—the comparative merits of the two modes of collecting the revenue, usually known by the names of the Zemindary system, and the Ryotwar system. But this, like many other topics of Mr. Thornton's book, may be thought to lie beyond the limits of our peculiar province; and it is certain that they lie beyond the limits of the space we have to spare. But there is one subject of a nature so interesting at the present moment, that we cannot abstain from some allusion to it: we mean, the project, now in agitation, for establishing a communication, by steam, between Britain and Hindostan. The three leading routes are, 1. By the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates: 2. By the Red Sea: 3. The usual passage by the Cape of Good Hope. From the first and last, Mr. Thornton affirms,—and we think, affirms truly,—that little is to be hoped. The last, indeed, has been tried; but with very unpromising success. Steam navigation has hitherto been found adapted only to voyages of moderate duration, and to seas comparatively calm. The route by the Euphrates appears still more desperate. There are two parties combined against it: the River itself, and the Country through which it runs. The River, even according to the Report of Captain Chesney, the most sanguine advocate for the attempt, contains no less than *forty* obstructions, from rocks, shallows, and falls; and, at one spot, would impose upon the navigators the necessity of dragging their *Steamer* against the current! The *Urn of the River God*, therefore, is, evidently, in implacable hostility with boilers and paddles. The country is just as fiercely at war with the enterprize, as the river itself. And to show that this is so, it is only necessary to say, that it is inhabited by Arabs. The Arabs, probably, would not come into close conflict with the adventurers, or attempt to stop their vessel. That is not their way. But then, they have an ugly trick of firing from a distance; and we have the consoling assurance, that “they are very expert *marksmen*.” There would, consequently, be only one of two courses to be adopted. The tribes must, one and all, be disarmed by the payment of *Black Mail*; for, “with an Arab *Sheik* the power of annoyance is an article of commerce: he *sells it*, and often lives by it.” This expedient, however, might be found to be somewhat costly; to say nothing of the humiliation and dishonour. The other branch of the alternative is about equally promising; namely, that the navigators should be armed to the teeth, and constantly prepared for a running fight with the

children of the desert; a circumstance which must contribute signally to the comfort of the voyage: not to mention that it would give to the whole affair the appearance of a hostile invasion. Alexander the Great might, perhaps, have made such an experiment, with impunity, if not with success. How it is to be accomplished by a party of European adventurers, is a thing which altogether surpasses our comprehension.

There remains only to be considered the route by the Red Sea. We cannot stop to compare its advantages with its difficulties. There are two considerations, however, mentioned by Mr. Thornton, which may well curb our impatience for the success of the project. In the first place, whether the passage be by the Persian Gulf, or the Red Sea, countries must be traversed which are frequently visited by the plague; a circumstance which may help to content us with the prospect of doubling the Cape to the end of time; unless the plague shall, first, have been extirpated from the earth. But, in the second place, "there are," Mr. Thornton observes, "some political considerations connected with this subject which imperatively press themselves upon the attention. 'The Russians are but fifteen days' march from the Euphrates; and although they do not require to be taught that the course of that river will bear them towards India, it may be doubted whether our appearance upon it might not give rise to jealousies which would endanger our peace, if not our dominion. In Egypt, perhaps, we have still more to apprehend. Some of those who have interested themselves in the success of steam navigation by this route, contemplate it only as a preliminary measure, and anticipate the completion of the much-vaunted project for a canal, connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea. They seem to forget that this would strike a fatal blow at the commerce of England; or, if this result occur to them, they disregard it. The discovery of the passage by the Cape destroyed the commerce of Italy and the Mediterranean. The restoration of the trade of the East to its old channel, would have the like effect upon those countries into whose hands it has passed. It may not be in our power to arrest the progress of events; but it is madness to accelerate that which is fraught with ruin to ourselves.'"

Mr. Thornton's concluding chapter is short; but it is hopeful and animating, provided it correctly represents the opinions of those who have made the condition of India the object of their serious study. Our empire mainly rests upon opinion; a tenure which has an appearance of awful insecurity. But then, it is encouraging to know, that "in those parts of British India, which have been longest subject to our rule, our power is most firmly

“established. The people and the government have become more habituated to each other, and our authority is more cheerfully recognized from a perception of the benefits which it has conferred.”—(p. 348). Again—the Indian army is a phenomenon scarcely paralleled in the history of the world,—a native force maintained, and officered, by foreigners, for the purpose of keeping their own country in subjection! What more monstrous *impossibility* could have presented itself to the dreams of political romance? And yet we are assured that the fidelity of the sepoy is unshaken—his attachment to his officers, for the most part, admirable—and his discipline and courage equal to the severest exigencies and perils. Lastly—the Vulture of the North is “towering in his pride of place;” and by many it is suspected that his eye is looking from the height, towards the plains of Hindostan,—and that his nostril is “sagacious of the quarry from afar,”—and that he is watching for the moment when he may come down upon the prey. But what then?—our Indian frontier is almost unassailable; and the Bird of ravin has, at present, another carcase in his eye. So that these things move not our speculator; who concludes his work with a declaration—founded, we hope, on sufficient authority,—that “the British Empire in India is in a state of such security, as must disarm every fear, and leave its rulers at perfect liberty to devote an undivided attention to the advancement and happiness of the people.”

It may possibly be thought strange, that in the course of this notice we have hitherto failed to advert to one topic, most intimately connected with “the advancement and happiness of the people,” namely, the hopes and prospects of Christianity, in our Indian Empire. The reason for this omission is two-fold: first, that this is a subject which has copiously occupied our pages on many recent occasions; and, secondly, that there is nothing in the present volume which very powerfully invites us to a renewed introduction of it. We are happy to perceive, however, that Mr. Thornton adverts, with becoming seriousness, to the duty incumbent upon us, of labouring for the diffusion of Gospel truth in the East. “The worn-out Superstition,” he tells us, “is obviously falling to pieces; to be replaced, either by what is called the *Religion of Nature*, or by a better faith, to which that may be a stepping-stone. And it is for those, who take an interest in the diffusion of Christian Knowledge, to consider, whether we ought not to avail ourselves of the moral movement, and give it the best direction; and whether the duty of extending the knowledge of Divine Truth, is not especially pressed upon us, as well by the state of opinion and feeling in India, as by the position in which we stand towards that coun-

“try.” (p. 173.) This is modestly and temperately expressed; and it may not be the worse on that account. We, however, must be allowed to speak somewhat more openly and freely. We must be permitted, again and again, to remind our Christian countrymen, that, upon them a *dispensation is laid*, to send among the Heathen the knowledge of that Name, *besides which none other is given, under heaven, whereby we may be saved*. It is, indeed, highly probable that there may be a long *interregnum*, between the deposition of Idolatry, and the established dominion of the Cross. And, during this interval, it may happen that some shall profess to worship the One True God, while, in fact, they are worshipping only their own right hand (*Dextra mihi Deus!*). Still it would be something to have cast out the foul and sanguinary *legion*, which, for ages, has possessed the land. There would then, at least, be a hope that the rightful Sovereign would enter in, and take possession. And this, He, most assuredly, will do, provided that his messengers and servants shall labour, without fainting, in the holy work of preparing his way before Him. That this is a duty which He expects from us, the present Rulers of India, must be irresistibly manifest to all, who have eyes to see, and ears to hear, and hearts to understand, the noble works which He hath done for us, in the midst of that idolatrous people. He has there *given us great and goodly cities, which we builded not; and houses full of all good things, which we filled not; and wells digged, which we digged not; and fields and forests, which we planted not*. And why has He done this? Is it that we may *eat and be full*, and then forget the Lord who brought us up thither? Nay, rather is it, that we may be the stewards of his inheritance; that we may minister unto His gracious purposes, in planting His name among the Heathen; that having *freely received*, we may *freely give*. And is there not a *woe* written against us, if this, “our bounden duty and service,” should perish from our thoughts? What will the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, say unto Cæsar, if Cæsar exacts of men the things that be his; while he himself renders not unto God, the things that be God’s?

We have to conclude our notice of Mr. Thornton’s volume, by stating that, in spite of our animadversions, we have no doubt that it will, on the whole, be found very useful to that multitudinous class of persons, who are without time, or patience, or inclination, for more minute inquiries. It must help, at least, to open the eyes of the British Public, to the immensity of the interest which, in general, they so entirely and so habitually overlook. And, if it shall do this, the service will be worthy of all respectful acknowledgment.

While we were preparing these pages for the press, our attention was called to certain recent advices from Madras :* from which it would appear that the peace and harmony of our Tanjore missions have been disturbed by some angry discussions, and rather intemperate proceedings; and that it has been found necessary to resort to the authority of the bishop. These dissensions, it seems, have arisen out of the unwillingness of the Christians of high caste to treat the Pariah Christians, in all respects, as brethren. This intelligence is deeply afflicting. Our information relative to the particulars of the dispute, is, at present, much too imperfect to warrant us in offering any opinion of its merits. The subject is one of extreme delicacy. It demanded of Schwartz the constant exercise of that *meekness of wisdom*, for which he was so eminently distinguished: and we hope and trust that there has been no departure from the spirit which guided him through difficulties of the same description. We have no doubt that the matter has occupied the attention of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and to their discretion and wisdom we willingly leave it.

ART. II.—*Essay on Church Patronage; or a Brief Inquiry, on the ground of Scripture and Antiquity, into the People's right to choose their own Minister.* Blackwood, Edin. Cadell, London. 1835.

THIS is a very able pamphlet on a very interesting subject, and proceeds, we believe, from the pen of an author who has devoted no small share of attention to the ecclesiastical usages of antiquity. The “Dissertations vindicating the Church of England with regard to some essential points of polity and doctrine,” afford ample evidence that Mr. Sinclair has carefully read the best works of the early ages, and made familiar to his mind the practice as well as the principles of those purer times to which we are constantly referred for examples of all Christian excellence.

In the north, it appears, not less than in our own division of the kingdom, efforts are made to divest patrons of their rights, and to transfer to the people at large the privilege of appointing ministers to the charge of congregations. It therefore becomes a matter of some importance to determine whether there be in the New Testament, or in the ancient records of the Church, any authority for this projected innovation; because, if the claim so

* See Asiatic Journal, Jan. 1835. Intelligence, p. 10. Feb. 1835. Intelligence, p. 116. Also a letter from Mr. Schreyvogel, As. Journ. April, 1835, p. 148.

confidently made on behalf of the multitude shall be found destitute of all such warrant or countenance as might be supposed derivable from the period, when as yet Christianity was unconnected with civil government, we may advance to the conclusion that the advocate of popular pretensions must be actuated by other motives than the mere desire to restore the ecclesiastical form to its original beauty, or to recover a franchise which has been unjustly taken away. To clear away some doubts which have gathered round this question is the main object contemplated by Mr. Sinclair, for he tells us that an active and increasing party, both within the Kirk and without, have been long maintaining that the people possess a right—a *right divine and indefeasible*—to the election of their own ministers; and that the Church of Scotland, be its original constitution what it may, is not conformable in its present system to the scriptural and primitive model. Those, he tells us, who maintain these sentiments and yet remain within the Kirk, profess their hope that by the abolition of lay patronage the establishment will ere long be brought into accordance with the rules of Scripture and the practice of antiquity. Those without the Kirk, it is added, perceive that the rights of patrons and the possession of temporalities are inseparably connected; that lay patronage cannot be abolished while the Kirk continues to be established; and that the representatives of those who gave a portion of their income to provide for the spiritual instruction of the people, are intitled to resume the endowment, should the privilege of nomination be taken from them. Meanwhile, as he further remarks, these determined adversaries have had the sagacity to perceive that a strong plea is furnished for withdrawing the affections of the people from the institutions of their ancestors. The assertion of popular rights is soothing to the vanity of the multitude; it is in accordance with “the spirit of the age;” it may be stated pointedly in a few words; it seems, on a superficial study of the inspired writers and the early fathers, to have a plausible foundation; and the opposers of it are open to the suspicion or the insinuation of being influenced by political considerations, and of having more regard for the law of man than for the law of God.

Before proceeding to weigh the evidence supplied by antiquity Mr. Sinclair draws the attention of his reader to the following preliminaries, the import of which seems closely connected with a candid determination of the main point at issue. In the first place, the people’s right to choose their own minister is not a thing to be taken for granted, or admitted as a *natural* right. Secondly, the *onus probandi* rests entirely with the people’s advocate; inasmuch as all the precedents both of Scripture and antiquity unite in

proving that at least the right of granting *ordination* belonged exclusively to the church officers, who alone could give authority to minister in the congregation. Unless evidence to the contrary can be produced, there is a strong presumption that whoever gives authority, chooses the individual to receive it—that the ordainer, in short, selects the candidate to be ordained. It is justly observed, therefore, that it is not enough for the religious agitator to throw a mist over the subject and then exclaim that his cause is won: on the contrary, unless he clearly shews the privilege of electing to have been completely separated from the power of granting ordination, his cause is lost; the elector and ordainer merge into the same person. In the third place, the asserter of the people's claims must shew that popular election in the apostolical and primitive church *uniformly and universally* prevailed; for the lofty structure of a divine right cannot be established on the narrow basis of a few ambiguous instances contradicted by other precedents. To sustain his principle he must shew them to be numerous and invariable; for, if ministers in some places were elected by the rulers of the church, and in others by the people, it would be obvious that no precise rule on the subject had been divinely appointed, but that the Church was left to regulate the question at her own discretion.

Having thus prepared his ground, the author undertakes to shew that “during the whole of the three first centuries—the best and purest age of Christianity—there is no evidence whatever of authoritative intervention by the people.” The instance which presents itself on the very threshold of this inquiry, is that of the designation of Matthias to fill the place in the Apostolical College, rendered vacant by the apostasy and suicide of Judas; an example which is in general regarded as the stronghold of democratical pretension. But we presume, from the very nature of the case, that most persons will agree with Mr. Sinclair as to the impropriety of putting such an election to the vote, “because the object of casting lots was to leave the decision with God, and to give the new Apostle the same advantage with his elder brethren, that of an immediate designation from Heaven; and no proceeding could be more objectionable than to intermix a human with a divine choice—for the disciples to assume the power of choosing among candidates, and thus arbitrarily to restrict the Founder of the Church in his election. Such a restriction would have been indecent and profane; it would have been as it were to present a *leet* to the Almighty—a supposition to be at once rejected with abhorrence and indignation.”

An attempt has also been made to support the popular side of the question by a reference to the choice of the seven Deacons.

But there is no competent judge who will not readily adopt the sentiment of Beza when he sums up the argument in the following words: "as for what is alleged from Scripture about the election of Matthias and the Deacons, it is nothing to the purpose. This has been abundantly demonstrated." Indeed, the most skilful assertors of the people's claims admit that nominations by Apostles were quite independent of any intervention on the part of the laity. But they contend that a distinction should be drawn between extraordinary designations by inspired men and ordinary appointments by later governors of the Church; conceiving that, in the former case, the suffrages of the congregation were not required, while in the latter they were indispensable. "But where," to use the words of our author, "where is the authority for this distinction? Where is it explained in Scripture? Where is it sanctioned by antiquity? Does not the assertion of it amount to an acknowledgment that popular pretensions are without foundation in the Word of God?"

"The most anomalous elective franchise in the ancient Church prevailed at Alexandria, and is understood to have been introduced by St. Mark, the first bishop. The Evangelist 'had been directed by St. Peter' to take the charge of that diocese, and having thus himself been nominated without popular interference, he devised a system by which that dangerous influence should be effectually excluded from the election of his successors. He restricted the right of voting to the twelve presbyters of the city, and enacted that they should choose their bishop from among themselves. On one occasion, mentioned by Severus, the presbyters, after their bishop's death, met together and prayed, and then proceeded to the election. The senior minister declared to the provincial synod, that to them (the city ministers) belonged the right of choosing their own bishop. The synod, while they assented to this claim, declared that if the bishop designate were worthy of the office, they would proceed to the consecration, otherwise they would reject him. This constitution lasted till the period of the Nicene Council, when the presbyters, by mutual agreement, resolved thenceforward to elect the most deserving candidate, whether he were their fellow presbyter or not. The circumstance, that the restriction of the elective franchise to the Alexandrian presbyters was not only acquiesced in and approved by the whole Church for several centuries, but ascribed to an Evangelist, is a clear demonstration that no idea was entertained of a divine right in the people of Alexandria to elect their own church officers."

In the times properly described as apostolic, there can be no doubt that, as the selection of persons duly qualified to serve in the sacred ministry was in the hands of inspired men, the nomination to pastoral charges was exercised independently of the people, among whom the new clergy were to be placed. But in proportion as the Church approached to its more ordinary condi-

tion, and the priesthood were accustomed to look to their flocks for a maintenance, a species of controul insensibly sprang up, conveying to these assemblies the right to express their concurrence in the appointment of their spiritual guides. Nothing is more obvious or more agreeable to the wonted course of human affairs than that patronage will tend to the point whence emolument is provided. If the people support the clergyman, they will, as a necessary consequence, claim the privilege of being consulted whenever a vacancy is to be supplied. We accordingly find, from a careful examination of historical records, that the influence of laymen first appeared in the very form now suggested; and that, in common cases, to render an election valid, the consent of the people more immediately concerned became nearly indispensable. Their voice, however, is understood to have simply expressed assent or concurrence, and appears not to have been employed in actual voting, in such a way, at least, as to make a direct choice of one out of several candidates presented to them by the governors of the Church. There is not, in fact, any reason to believe that, before the days of Constantine, persons in holy orders were ordained to a *ministerium vagum*, and had no employment until they were invited by a particular congregation to preside over their spiritual interests. Guided by the lights which have reached us through the lapse of fifteen centuries, as well as by the analogy of ecclesiastical proceedings in later ages, we feel justified in asserting that no man in those times was ordained except to some special charge; and hence, that the laying on of hands by the bishop, and the nomination of the young priest to a professional cure, were, in the usual course of things, strictly simultaneous. But it is, nevertheless, perfectly manifest that the acquiescence of the Christian body came to be considered as an essential condition in the contract which bound a minister to his office, as the immediate pastor of a fixed and determinate flock.

The mode, however, in which the acquiescence now mentioned was sometimes expressed, has created on the part of authors, not much disposed to favour popular ambition, no small degree of misunderstanding. As the term suffrage is ambiguous, and may denote either a direct exercise of power or a merely passive concurrence, the voice of the people, expressing satisfaction on the one hand, or displeasure on the other, has been represented as the primary instrument of election. But on this point, where he has been eminently successful, we prefer the words of Mr. Sinclair himself.

“ Among the most important witnesses in this great argument is St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who, in the case before us, is usually cited by the democratic advocate, and profusely eulogised for his knowledge

of apostolical institutions, although on other questions not less important, he is superciliously scoffed at, as an innovating, ambitious, arbitrary, domineering high-churchman." . . . "It is remarkable that, although throughout his writings, we read of numerous promotions to the episcopal office, sometimes attended with the most vehement contentions, there are only a few passages which would convey the most remote idea that the people were in possession of the elective franchise. These passages, however, have been so triumphantly brought forward that we are obliged to give them a deliberate investigation. One of them relates to the appointment of Cornelius to the Bishopric of Rome, which St. Cyprian describes as having taken place 'by the designation of God and his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the *suffrages* of the people, who were then present, and by the college of ancient bishops and good men.' The votary of popular pretensions, full of joy and exultation, bids us mark this word *suffrage* and acknowledge that his cause is won. But, before resolving to yield an argument supported by the decisive grounds already mentioned both from Scripture and antiquity, we thought it necessary to inquire into the meaning of the word *suffrage*, as ascertained by the use of Cyprian and his contemporaries; and we found our courage re-assured by the discovery that throughout all the Cyprianic monuments, there is not a single place where *suffragium* of necessity implies voting, while there are numerous examples where it can signify no more than acquiescence, testimony, approbation, satisfaction. Thus, in his discourse on the vanity of idols, he speaks of Brutus putting his sons to death, 'that the credit of his consulship might be raised by the *suffrage* of a crime'—not, surely, meaning an elective vote. In the same work he describes the Jews, 'with violent and pertinacious *suffrages* most earnestly insisting on our Saviour's death.' He means entreaties or demands; for he could not mean that Pilate put the question to the vote whether sentence should be pronounced. To select another instance: In his discourse on envy, he represents the people of Israel, on the return of David from the slaughter of the Philistines, 'bursting forth into a *suffrage* of commendation.' In the case of Cornelius, there are innumerable reasons for not applying the word *suffrage* to a poll or ballot. For, first of all, Cyprian himself declares that his contemporary was appointed by 'divine designation,' which, according to a pious maxim of his own, 'would supersede all human voting.' Again, he would not be likely to give the people the elective franchise while he denied it to the clergy, whom he restricts to the privilege of bearing testimony. And further, in another of his Epistles, he affirms Cornelius to have been 'ordained by the designation of God, and by the *suffrages* of the clergy and people;' thus showing plainly, since he had before described the clergy as only bearing testimony, that, 'to give a *suffrage*' and 'to bear testimony' have with him the same signification."

Mr. Sinclair is equally successful in explaining another remark of the same ancient writer, on which great stress has been laid by the advocates of plebeian assumption. The eloquent Father observes, that "the people have especially the power of choosing

worthy bishops and of rejecting the unworthy." Taken by itself and separated from the context, this expression might seem to indicate that the general body of the laity were, in fact, invested with authority to elect not only their own ministers, but even the highest order of the clergy. But when examined in connection with the object which the pious author had in view, it will be found to convey nothing more than this simple assurance, that believers in Christ, whatever might be their rank or station, had the option of withdrawing from the communion of a certain prelate, stained with error and apostacy, and of placing themselves under the spiritual rule of one who had been canonically appointed to succeed him. His words will now appear in their true signification. "A people who yield obedience to our Lord's commands and fear God, ought to separate from a scandalous bishop, and not pollute themselves with the services of a sacrilegious priest; because they specially have the power of choosing worthy bishops and of rejecting the unworthy."

The passage just quoted occurs in a synodical epistle, drawn up by Cyprian and thirty-seven of his colleagues, who had been consulted by the people of the diocese in which the idolatrous Basilides had once presided. After giving their opinion as to the propriety of abandoning the jurisdiction of an Ordinary who, in time of persecution, had lapsed so far as to join in the worship of false gods, they add the following satisfactory account of the method then adopted for episcopal elections and consecrations. "The rule," say they, "which has descended to us from divine tradition and apostolical practice, ought diligently to be observed, and indeed is actually observed by us, and generally throughout all provinces; that for duly celebrating ordinations, all the neighbouring prelates shall meet together where a bishop is to be ordained, and that he shall be chosen *in presence of the people*, who most fully know the life of every candidate, and have most familiarly observed his conduct and character." We have here a distinct view of the mode in which episcopal promotions were conducted in the Cyprianic age. The bishops of the province met together at the vacant see, and there elected, consecrated, and admitted into their college the candidate whom they judged best fitted for the office; and the whole transaction took place in the presence of the people, because they were the best witnesses of his life and conversation.

"A similar arrangement was observed at the election of presbyters. The diocesan, in conjunction with his consistory, summoned the congregation, named the candidate whom he had selected, asked this testimony to his character, and then publicly filled up the vacant charge. For many centuries the rule was almost invariably observed that no candidate should

be ordained without a *title* or nomination to some vacancy. It is a great error to suppose a primitive Christian congregation hearing a succession of unemployed presbyters pass through the ordeal of a trial sermon, and choosing the individual whose doctrine and address they most approved. There were no unemployed presbyters to preach before them; and translations from one pastoral charge to another, not only were extremely rare, but depended solely upon the judgment of the diocesan."

Origen, as quoted by our author, speaks to a similar effect.

"Although our Lord had laid down rules for the installation of the high-priest, and had himself elected him, yet the congregation also is convened. For, in the ordination of a priest, the *presence* of the people is indispensable, that all may know and be assured that the individual most excellent, most learned, most holy, and most distinguished for every virtue, is selected for the priesthood; and this is done, the people standing by, (*adstante populo*), that there may be no room afterwards for scruples or retractions. This is what the Apostle commands in the ordination of a bishop, that he should have a good report, or testimony, of them which are without."

A striking allusion to this practice is found in the *Life of Alexander Severus*. Referring to the rules which this monarch observed in promoting men to different offices in the civil administration of the empire, Lampridius remarks that he published their names, exhorting the people that, if any man had a crime to allege against the candidate, he should substantiate his charge by evident proof, under pain of capital punishment if he failed. He assigned as his reason, that, since both Christians and Jews were thus accustomed to proclaim the names of those who were to be ordained priests, it was hard that the same course should not be taken with respect to the governors of provinces, to whom were entrusted the lives and fortunes of mankind.

"This passage," says Mr. Sinclair, "illustrates the above citations from St. Cyprian, from the African Council, and from Origen. It will not be imagined that the emperor wished his governors to be elected by the suffrages of the people, or rather, it is incontestible from the very words of Lampridius, that no other privilege was allowed them in such promotions, but that of bearing testimony; that this privilege was conceded in imitation of the Jews and Christians in their promotions to the priesthood, and that the Christian laity had no more a right of suffrage in the election of their bishops than the Jewish multitude in the appointment of their priests, or the Roman populace in the designation of their proconsuls."

In a word, the *form of procedure* at all clerical elections appears to have been as follows. To whatever order in the ministry the aspirant claimed admission, the lay brethren, on the mention of his name, were required to answer "worthy" or "unworthy;" and thereby to signify their approbation or disap-

probation of his moral character. It seems, however, to be taken for granted by those who espouse the popular side of the question, that any layman, according to his fancy, might casually propose a candidate, and that if a majority of voices chanced to shout in his favour, he became the people's nominee, and in that character was presented to the synod or consistory. "But this," as the author observes, "is wholly to misconceive, or rather to invert, the canonical regulation; for although the multitude occasionally in riotous and disorderly meetings usurped the privilege of nomination, it did not rightfully belong to them. By the rules of the church the people did not propose a presentee to be approved by the ecclesiastical rulers; on the contrary, these last proposed a presentee to be approved by the people; this important fact is evident from the decision of a general council in the case of the Melitian bishops. The Nicene Fathers came to a resolution that these prelates, who had been schismatically consecrated, should remain in the episcopal order, but, until they were appointed to vacant sees, should not exercise episcopal functions, nor, in particular, enjoy the privilege of 'proposing the names of persons to be ordained to any order in the sacred ministry; which privilege should belong exclusively to those orthodox bishops who had been uniformly free from the guilt of schism.' Valerius, on the authority of Gregory the Great, asserts in direct terms the fact implied in the decree just mentioned: 'the bishops announced to the people the names of those who were to be admitted priests or deacons, that, if any man had objections to the persons fixed upon, he might openly bear testimony against them.'

We need scarcely observe that there is a close resemblance between the forms appointed in the Church of England and those above described, as having been generally received throughout Christendom from the days of the Apostles. It is required that, in the course of divine service, notice shall be given in the parish where the candidate has resided, of his desire to be ordained; and the people, "who best know his life and conversation," are invited to come forward and state objections. It is required, also, that the ceremony of ordination shall take place before the eyes of all men and in presence of the congregation, who, in the name of God, are urged, if they know "any impediment or notable crime," at once to declare it.

The conclusions to which we are conducted by the author of this "*Essay on Church Patronage*," are amply confirmed by other writers, especially Dr. Hickes, in his "*Christian Priesthood*," and Bishop Beveridge, in his "*Annotations on the Canons of the Council of Nice*." "It appears," says this learned prelate,

“that the right of election belonged to the bishops present, the testimony, consent, and approbation of the election, to the people—*Jus igitur electionis ad episcopos præsentēs, testimonium autem, consensus et electionis comprobatio ad plebem pertinet.*” He adds, however, “that the people sometimes proposed a person to be chosen to the bishops; but the bishops did not always choose the persons proposed to them by the people; and therefore the whole determination of the election was in the power of the bishops, insomuch that we may read of many episcopal ordinations and elections performed by bishops without the people, but of none by the people without bishops—*usque adeo ut multas legere sit episcopales ordinationes et electiones etiam celebratas ab episcopis sine plebe, à plebe autem sine episcopis nullas.*”

Dr. Hickes, in his *Treatise on the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*, or rather in the sixth dissertation appended to it, makes the following observations on the Epistles of St. Cyprian, from which he had already quoted several passages:—1, In ordinations of the clergy, he was always accustomed to consult the people, and to desire their judgment and testimony; 2, that the holy martyr consulted the people in this case for no other end but to weigh the manners and merits of every person by common counsel, and, by that means, the better to know their course of life; and 3, that St. Cyprian did not think even this so necessary as that without it no ordinations might be accounted legitimate. On the contrary, when the necessity of the times required it, it is certain that without either the advice, or testimony, or suffrage of the people, he both nominated persons to be admitted into the clergy, and having nominated, elected them, and consecrated those he had thus elected.

We are indebted to the same learned person for the extracts we are now about to give from the canons of the Council of Laodicea. In the XIIth, it is said, “That bishops ought to be appointed to the government of the Church by the judgment of the metropolitans and of the neighbouring bishops; and that they ought to be such as have been long approved by the word of faith, and by the dispensation of right doctrine.” And in the XIIIth, it is provided, “That the people are not to be allowed to make choice of those who are to be employed in the sacred function.” Hence it may be collected with the greatest clearness, that the multitude of the faithful had not by divine right either suffrage or testimony in the election of bishops; for, if the power had belonged to the people by divine right, it could never have been extinguished by a synod, and that especially by a particular synod. This view will be still further confirmed by the XVIIIth canon of the Council of Antioch, expressed in these terms, “If any

man who is ordained a bishop do not come to the diocese for which he is chosen, not through his own fault, but either because the people refuse him, or for any other reason occasioned by no fault of his, he shall enjoy both the honour and the function, provided he give no disturbance to the affairs of the Church where he abides. And he shall wait for the determination which a full synod of the province shall make upon the judgment of his case.

“What,” exclaims the zealous non-juror from whom we are now quoting, “are we to think of this canon?” It certainly makes very little for the power of the laity; showing, on the contrary, that the Church in those days did not so much as dream of their right, afterwards so vehemently asserted, to choose their own pastors, whether parochial or diocesan. The council commands, in the most unambiguous language, that a bishop ordained by the bishops of the province, and confirmed by the metropolitans according to the ancient canons, ought to remain a bishop and perform the episcopal functions, though the laity make never so much opposition. This was the method of elections in the fourth century; but afterwards the metropolitans obtained a much larger power, not without a very great advantage to the Church. They summoned an episcopal synod to meet in their own cathedrals, and by the common consent of the bishops, set patrons over the Churches; and thus it is made manifest, that both the nomination and election belonged to the metropolitan, assisted by the advice of the comprovincial prelates. Nay, without this authority and consent, the people had not power to take to themselves what the canonists denominate a vacant bishop. Such an exercise of discretion was prohibited by the XVIth rule of the Council of Antioch: “If any vacant bishop shall come into any vacant church, and by stealth invade the throne, without leave of a full synod, he ought to be ejected, though all the people, whom he invaded, may have chosen him for their bishop. Now that is called a full synod in which the metropolitan is present. Τελείαν δὲ ἐκείνην εἶναι σύνοδον ἣ συμπάρεστι καὶ ὁ μητροπολίτης.

From an examination of the particulars now stated, Dr. Hickes comes to a result very similar to that pronounced by Mr. Sinclair: first, that in the most ancient times of the Church, the people had no suffrages which were truly elective; secondly, that the power which they afterwards exercised was not derived from any divine or original right, but from the leave, and indulgence, and corrupt remissness of the bishops. That the Church did afterwards, for most just causes, and by a most just authority, abrogate this tumultuous method of ordaining, and restrain the mad rage of the people within its proper bounds.

There is no doubt that this was the general rule according to which elections were conducted from the middle of the third to the end of the fourth century. But it must, at the same time, be acknowledged that there are on record many exceptions, occasioned sometimes by the ambition of the clergy, and not unfrequently by the impatience of their followers. In the second chapter of the fourth book of Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* will be found a number of cases wherein the laity appear to have assumed the direction of affairs, and to have guided the deliberations of their spiritual fathers; all which might seem to argue that the people had something of a decisive voice in elections, and that their suffrage was not merely testimonial. The privilege of expressing their approbation and concurrence led, indeed, very naturally to the assumption of higher powers; while the governors of the church, influenced by their love of peace, and unwilling to thwart the zeal of pious believers in the exercise of what they had begun to consider an indisputable right, gradually permitted the prerogative of their order to be usurped by a class of men who did not fail to abuse it. By degrees the irregularities increased, and attempts were every where made to turn the privilege of bearing witness into that of giving a vote.

"In times of danger and persecution, the bishops had little difficulty in restraining these licentious tendencies; but during periods of safety and tranquillity, and when the Christian population bore a large proportion to the heathen, the sanctity of their office was no protection to them from democratical usurpation. The divisions in the Church, caused by the Arians and Donatists, contributed to weaken the episcopal authority. Many of these heretics would insinuate themselves into the cathedral with their orthodox brethren, on purpose to enjoy and augment the general confusion. The sacred edifice, crowded by a vast concourse from all the neighbouring towns and villages, became the scene of hopeless uproar and scandalous commotion. On the mention of an unpopular candidate, however eminent for virtue or abilities, 'he was assailed,' says St. Chrysostom, 'with as many accusations as there were heads or leaders among the people.' The wild caprice of these self-constituted electors, but for the solemnity of the occasion, would sometimes provoke a smile. A voice, for instance, is raised at Milan, among the crowd, 'Let Ambrose be Bishop!' The name is heard and repeated by the humour of the by-standers: it spreads through all the aisles and galleries, and is at last vociferated by the whole multitude. The individual thus casually mentioned was a layman; he was a soldier; he was not even a Christian. Sensible of the absurdity of his situation, the astonished warrior fled from the sacred honours thus obstreperously thrust upon him. He is pursued, overtaken, hurried back to the cathedral, and soon finds himself, by a rapid series of ordinances, baptized, confirmed, ordained, consecrated, installed a bishop, a metropolitan!"

Mr. Sinclair further reminds his readers of the disorders at Antioch on the election of Eustathius, which were so outrageous that, had not the emperor interposed at the head of a military force, both the church and the city would have been destroyed. He likewise mentions the uproar at Cæsarea, occasioned by a clerical election, the difficulty with which the riot was appeased, and the remark of Gregory Nazianzen, that the populace at such times were "extremely prone to insurrectionary movements." Next, he brings under our notice the lamentations of the same writer over the factions and disturbances produced by popular suffrage; his earnest wish that the elective franchise were entrusted to the clergy; and his memorable declaration, that no republic was so disorderly as the Christian Church had been rendered by democratic ascendancy. Who is ignorant of what Evagrius relates respecting the insurrection at Alexandria during the election of Pretorius; how the people rose upon the magistrates and soldiers who endeavoured to maintain order; how they murdered the patriots, pursued the troops into the temple of Serapis, pillaged that wealthy edifice, and burned the garrison alive? Equally well-known are the furious seditions at Constantinople, so faithfully recorded by Socrates and Sozomen; the imminent peril into which that great metropolis was brought by the contending factions; and the necessity of restoring peace by banishments, confiscations, and the sword. Similar calamities brought disgrace upon the Church at Rome itself, and throughout the whole empire. Ammianus has recorded the frightful massacre in the capital of Italy when Damasus was elected; how, in time of profound peace, without any point of doctrine to divide the rival parties, a sedition broke out with violence, raged several days, and was not put down till after one hundred and thirty-seven persons were stretched dead in the streets. It thus appears, that, when the multitude began to take a part in elections, "they behaved themselves," says Jeremy Taylor, "with so much insolence, partiality, faction, sedition, cruelty, and Pagan baseness, that they were quite interdicted above one thousand two hundred years ago; so that they had this little in possession but a little while, and never had any due; and, therefore, now their request for it is no petition of right, but a popular ambition, and a snatching at a sword to hew the church in pieces."

The considerations now stated, as well as the conviction that the laity had no right to an elective vote, made a deep impression all over Europe at the period of the Reformation. At Geneva, for example, "the clergy were appointed by the Council," because, as Beza remarked, a popular franchise "had no ground in Scripture, nor any right in antiquity, and would give rise to infinite

disorders." In France, the pastors among the Huguenots were chosen by their respective presbyteries; in Sweden, the highest ecclesiastical authorities were nominated by the civil power; the same rule was observed in Denmark and among the Lutherans in Germany; while in Holland, by the Synod of Dort, the rights of patrons, after due consideration, were solemnly and canonically sanctioned. Even the early English Presbyterians not only did not uphold the people's fancied divine right, but in their celebrated "*Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*" disproved it with equal zeal and force of argument.—p. 40.

The origin of lay patronage, as it now exists, is, no doubt, to be found in that contract between the rulers of the Church and the owners of land, by which the one party bound themselves to supply spiritual instruction, provided the other would grant a regular and permanent maintenance to the clergymen who might be deputed for that purpose. The privilege of selecting a minister for parochial church or domestic chapel, would soon be conceded to every individual who set apart either tithes or a portion of his fields, in the shape of a fixed living to the incumbent; the prelates retaining the power of determining the qualifications, whether of learning or character, without which no one could be admitted into holy orders.

In Scotland, we learn, the General Assembly of the Kirk has lately sanctioned a measure, which, in effect, deprives patrons of their right, and, at the same time, exposes every nominee to a parish to the caprice or resentment of the people, who, in rejecting him, can take their revenge for any supposed injury or unpopular act with which they may conceive the lord of the manor to be chargeable. According to the rule now mentioned, if a majority of the adult population shall be pleased to refuse the presentee, the deed of the patron is null and void. He may, indeed, exercise his privilege three times; but, if his candidate shall be as often rejected, the right of presenting devolves upon the Presbytery, who are invested with power to compel the reception of an incumbent. In using this discretionary prerogative, the parishioners are not called upon to give any reason for repudiating the individuals named by the lay superior; they may promulgate a silent veto; it is enough if they exhibit a majority against him. Nor can it be necessary to add that, in these times when the multitude are so easily excited against the nobility and landed interest, the favour of the legal patron is, of itself, sufficient in many cases to disqualify an aspirant for the respectable office of a parish minister.

Mr. Sinclair concludes with the following *argumentum ad hominem*, which will moderate the zeal of every consistent advocate for popular claims:

“We venture to put the question, ‘Are you not prepared, as a staunch disciple of John Knox, to acknowledge the corruption of human nature?’ He will reply at once, ‘No doctrine can be more unquestionable; no language can exaggerate the depravity and hardness of the human heart.’ We next enquire of him, ‘Do you imagine then that mankind will listen with delight or with aversion to godly views of religious truth?’ He answers with oracular solemnity, ‘They dislike the truth; they will not endure sound doctrine; they are reprobate concerning the faith; their self-sufficiency and worldly-mindedness predispose them to love falsehood, flattery, and strong delusions.’ Having received these orthodox and satisfactory replies we not unnaturally diverge into a kindred subject, and demand the reason of his anxiety to entrust the flock with the election of their own pastors? He readily rejoins, ‘My object is to secure the nomination of faithful ministers, who will be diligent in season and out of season, and be powerful as well as strict in inculcating the peculiarities of the Gospel.’ We finally request him to inform us whether he thinks the multitude are pleased with the peculiarities of the Gospel, and are likely to select ministers who will preach them? He assures us gravely, that nothing is more certain, and thus gives us with devout simplicity to understand that mankind are infinitely indisposed to hear sound doctrine, but that whenever they are called together for the election of their minister, they will show an infinite alacrity to receive it. Why does the religious agitator not perceive the inconsistency of these statements? Why does he not acknowledge, that to secure the appointment of proper ministers is a problem not so easy to be solved as he has blindly and empirically imagined? Why does he not regard the question with calmness, respect existing interests, refrain from grasping recklessly at perfection, teach the people to bear with patience trifling evils rather than hazard all by rushing into innovation; in short, exert himself to extenuate defects and re-establish tranquillity, instead of magnifying grievances and fostering AGITATION.”

The exercise of patronage has never been held as perfectly consistent with the democratical spirit of the Kirk, which, originating in popular favour, has generally supported the claims of the multitude when opposed to those of the higher classes. In times of tumult and disorder these claims never fail to be renewed; and at the present moment, in particular, when all ancient principles and usages are treated with contempt, the advocates of plebeian influence display an unusual degree of activity. As in 1642, the spirit of insubordination, kindled by the Scots, threatens to cross the Tweed, carrying with it an avowed hostility to all ecclesiastical establishments, to all prelatical distinctions, and, more especially, to the voice of lay-patrons in the nomination of the clergy. It is for this reason that we attribute so much importance to Mr. Sinclair’s pamphlet.

ART. III.—*The Life of Bishop Jewel.* By Charles Webb Le Bas, M.A., Professor in the East India College, Herts, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London, 1835. Rivingtons. pp. 345.

THE personal history of Bishop Jewel might, perhaps, be comprised in a very few sentences; but the prominent station which he holds among the Fathers of the English Reformation gives peculiar interest to all his actions: and it is with singular pleasure that we here find them recorded by a Biographer not exceeded by any of our contemporaries in acuteness of judgment, in copiousness of Theological learning, and in cordial attachment to that Church, the cradle of which was rocked by the subject of his labours.

John Jewel was born on the 22d of May, 1522, at his father's seat, Buden, in the parish of Berimber, Devonshire. As one of a family of ten children, his patrimony was not likely to be considerable. The chief education of his boyhood was conducted at Barnstaple; and he was admitted at Merton College, Oxford, before he had attained thirteen years of age. John Parkhurst, who was finally promoted to the See of Norwich, there became his tutor. Parkhurst had imbibed the principles of the Reformation during a residence in Magdalen College; and being desirous to compare the translations of the New Testament executed respectively by Tindal and by Coverdale, he employed his pupil to read the former version aloud, while himself kept his eyes upon the latter. Some looks of intelligence which escaped the youth, on the occurrence of remarkable passages, were not lost upon Parkhurst, who, on observing him smile at those words in the Apocalypse which rebuke the lukewarmness of the Laodiceans, exclaimed, "Surely Paul's Cross will, one day, ring of this boy!"

A rheumatic affection, brought on by habits of study protracted to a late hour, struck to one of Jewel's feet, and produced an incurable lameness. After some years of preparation at Merton, he removed to Corpus, in which Society he acquired much distinction by his exercises. On the 20th of October, 1540, he proceeded to the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, and during the next seven years he was tranquilly employed in dispensing to others the vast stores of knowledge which he had acquired by the application of *eighteen* hours daily to literary toil. Horace, it is said, he had entirely by heart; Cicero among the ancients, and Erasmus among the moderns, were his favourite prose authors.

His circle of study embraced History and Philosophy, Logic and Mathematics; and his acquisitions in these and in every other science were sedulously directed upon that one—which he had early learned to esteem the sum and mistress of them all—Theology.

His purity of morals and suavity of demeanour were not less remarkable than were the quickness of his intellect, and the depth and the variety of his attainments. Heretic, Zuinglian, and Lutheran, as he was esteemed by some of the older members of his College, all of them admitted that he was an honest man—nay, that he “certainly was an Angel in his life.” As a private Lecturer, he enjoyed high reputation; and his Readings in Humanity and in Rhetoric attracted crowded audiences from every College in Oxford.

On the 9th of February, 1544, he commenced Master of Arts; and the charges of his Degree were defrayed by his excellent friend and quondam tutor, Parkhurst, then incumbent of the valuable Rectory of Cleve, of whom the following honourable anecdote is related :—

“Jewel was in the habit of visiting him by invitation, at his rectory of Cleve, two or three times in the course of each year; and, sometimes, in company with other meritorious young men, who, like himself, were struggling through the difficulties and expenses of an academic education; and from these visits he seldom returned without substantial proofs of the liberality of his host. On one occasion, more particularly, we are told that Parkhurst entered the chamber of Jewel and his companions, on the morning fixed for their return to Oxford, and, suddenly seizing on their purses, humorously exclaimed, ‘I wonder what money these miserable and beggarly Oxonians have about them?’ The exhibition, it may be imagined, was *beggarly* enough. The purses were, indeed, most pitifully lean and empty; but the generosity of Parkhurst sent them away in a thriving and prosperous condition.”—pp. 12, 13.

Neither the time of Jewel's ordination, nor that of his election to a Fellowship of Corpus, has been transmitted to us; but he soon became well known as a zealous friend of the *New Learning*; and when Peter Martyr was appointed Professor of Divinity, a close and confidential intimacy was established between these two great and upright scholars, which continued through life, and was attended with the happiest results. Soon after taking the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity, Jewel accepted the trifling Living of Sunningwell, near Oxford; and notwithstanding his lameness, which made the journeys irksome and painful, he walked to the church of that parish on every other Sunday, in order that he might exercise pastoral duties to a country flock.

On the accession of Mary, these labours of love were not forgotten: he was accused of having constantly attended the Lectures of Peter Martyr, of having preached Heresy, of having been ordained according to the New Service Book, and of having refused to be present at Mass. On these charges he was sentenced to expulsion from his College; and how deeply he felt the unjust award may be determined from the simple and touching address in which he took leave of his former associates:—

“ ‘ In these my latest lectures, I have done that which famished men are used to do, who, when they see that their meal is likely to be suddenly and unexpectedly snatched from them, gorge themselves with greater haste and greediness. For, when once I resolved thus to put an end to my lectures, and perceived that I was forthwith to be deprived of speaking to you, (which was, as it were, my daily bread,) I scrupled not, contrary to my former usage, to lay before you much unpalatable, hasty, ill-prepared matter; for I perceive that I have fallen upon the displeasure and the evil eyes of some—by what ill desert of mine, it is for them to consider. Certain it is, that they who would not have me here would not suffer me to live any where, if it were in their power. I yield, however, to the pressure of the times; and if they can derive any satisfaction from my calamity, I would offer no hindrance to it. But, as Aristides prayed when he was going into banishment and quitting his native soil, even so do I now pray to the Almighty and Most Gracious God, that they whom I am now leaving may think of me no more. And what more than this can they desire? And yet I would beseech you, young men, to pardon me if I grieve to be torn away from the spot which was the scene of my earlier days, where I have since lived, and where I have been in some esteem and honour. But why do I delay to sum up my ruin in one word? Woe is me, that—grievous as it is to utter it—I now must say, farewell my studies! farewell these abodes! farewell this polished seat of learning! farewell your delightful society and converse! farewell, young men! farewell, lads! farewell, associates! farewell, brethren! farewell, beloved in mine eyes!—farewell, all, farewell!’ ”—pp. 21, 22.

On his deprivation at Corpus, he was received with open arms at Broadgates Hall, since known as Pembroke College; and, during his residence in that asylum, he was employed by the University to frame an Address of Congratulation to the new Queen. The task was one of no slight difficulty, but Mary was not as yet dipped in the blood of the Saints; and it by no means appears, from the abstract of the Paper which has descended to us, that the champion of Protestantism in any way compromised his religious principles by his demonstration of loyalty. On the contrary, he was soon watched more jealously than before. Marshal, the Dean of Christchurch—who, in the course of

three reigns, signalized himself by triple apostacy—undertook his *surveillance*, and presenting to him a document containing a summary of the more essential doctrines of Romanism, demanded immediate subscription, and pointed to the stake as the alternative upon refusal. Jewel had in some degree foreseen the gathering of this tempest; but in his hour of peril and temptation he was deprived of the support of his ablest friend. He had already visited Cleve, on foot, in the depth of winter; but Parkhurst, terrified at the restoration of the Mass, had withdrawn, and was in concealment. Left entirely to himself, Jewel was unable to withstand the fear of Martyrdom, and, in an evil moment, “with an air of levity which must sadly have belied the heaviness of his heart, he said, ‘What! have you a mind to see how well I can write?’” took the pen, and signed his Recantation.

His enemies, however, seem to have been fully aware how little the spirit sympathized with the flesh in this act of frailty; and Jewel received intelligence by which he was convinced that nothing except flight could save him from destruction.

“His escape, it seems, was almost through the very fire! Had he remained in Oxford but one night longer, he must inevitably have perished; nay, had he travelled to London by the direct road, his pursuers would have been upon him. Whether by accident or design, however, he fortunately took a different way. Notwithstanding his lameness, he was under the necessity of going on foot; and having travelled till he was exhausted with weariness and misery, and half dead with cold, he threw himself on the ground; and that night would probably have been his last, if he had not been providentially discovered by Augustine Berner, a Swiss, who had been a servant to Bishop Latimer, and was afterwards a minister of the Gospel. To that faithful servant of God, Jewel owed his preservation. Berner, on seeing his wretched condition, immediately provided him with a horse, and conveyed him to the house of the Lady Ann Warcup, a widow, who was a firm friend to the suffering Protestants. From her he received entertainment and protection, until a convenient opportunity occurred for sending him on to London.

“But even in London his situation was imminently perilous. He was compelled to change his lodgings several times. Happily he found a powerful friend in Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, who kindly furnished him with money for his journey, and procured him a safe passage to the continent. He immediately repaired to Frankfort, which was then a chief city of refuge for the persecuted Reformers, and arrived there at the beginning of the second year of Queen Mary’s reign; that is, somewhere about July or August, 1555.”—pp. 32, 33.

Surrounded by fellow-Protestants at Frankfort, he regained his former course; and as his subscription to the Popish Articles

had been publicly offered in St. Mary's Church at Oxford, he by no means shrank from the self-abasement of an equally public abjuration. On the Sunday after his arrival, he proclaimed his own weakness from the pulpit, imploring the pardon of God whom he had offended, and of the Church which he had dishonoured. "In a voice almost stifled with sighs and tears, he exclaimed, 'It was my abject and cowardly mind and faint heart that made my weak hand commit this wickedness.'" How far the good Spirit of God might have been vouchsafed to support any of us if we had been exposed to a trial similar to that of Jewel, so that we might have escaped his fall, it is not possible to determine; but sure we are, that there is a sweetness of savour in the contrition which succeeded his infirmity which must have ascended as a grateful sacrifice to the Throne of Mercy!

Peter Martyr, immediately on the death of Edward VI., had resigned the Divinity Chair at Oxford, and had withdrawn to Strasburgh, to which city he earnestly invited his friend Jewel to repair. The Exile accordingly domesticated himself in the house of his former teacher, and found assembled round him a noble army of Confessors; for, among the English fugitives who at that time were gathered in Strasburgh, are numbered the bright names of Nowell, Cole, Ponet, Grindal, Edwin Sandys, Sir John Cheke, and Sir Anthony Cooke. Jewel was habituated to some private system of short-hand; and he in some degree repaid the kindness of his benefactor by writing down the substance of his Lectures, as they were orally delivered. It was in this manner, after the rough draft had been carefully revised by Martyr himself, that his *Commentary on the Book of Judges* was prepared for the press.

When Martyr succeeded to the Hebrew Professorship at Zurich, Jewel accompanied him to his new residence. The liberality of his friend during some part of this connexion enabled him also to cross the Alps, in order to make a short visit to Padua; and within two months from the dawn of brighter days, on the accession of Elizabeth, we find him on his route to England. The correspondence, which at that season he maintained with Peter Martyr and with Bullinger, is replete with interest, and fully acquaints us with the hopes and fears as to the state of Religion by which men's minds were then so powerfully agitated. Elizabeth proceeded wisely and cautiously; and we can scarcely be surprised that by zealous contemporaries her course was often esteemed much too slow. Jewel was by no means wanting in the expression of this very natural impatience. "In the time of Mary," he says, "every thing was carried impetuously

forward. There was no waiting for law or precedent. But now every thing is managed with as much slowness and wariness, as if the Word of God was not to be received on His own authority. As Christ was *thrown out* by His enemies, so is He now *kept out* by His friends. The consequence is, that they who favour us are grievously discouraged, while our adversaries are still full of hope and exultation." To this feverishness, which it would have been strange indeed if Jewel had escaped, Mr. Le Bas furnishes an admirable corrective in a very few lines:—

"At this day, we can all perceive that the Queen was unquestionably right. In the existing state of things, nothing could have been more unwise than a precipitate course of proceeding. The strength and the stability of the Reformation would mainly depend on the appearance of grave and anxious deliberation with which it was carried on. All might have been lost, or at least fearfully endangered, by the violent counsels recommended by the more impatient of the Reformers."—p. 65.

In the general Visitation of the Dioceses ordered by Parliament, Jewel was appointed one of the Commissioners for the Western Division of England, and he appears to have exercised his office with much discretion, not dilapidating but rather edifying. In the North, matters were otherwise, and the *λειτουργία* had been excited by the Apostle of the Conventicle.

"In Scotland, every thing is in a ferment. Knox, surrounded by a numerous throng of satellites, is holding conventions throughout the whole kingdom. The old Queen has been compelled to shut herself up in garrison. The nobility, with a union of hearts and hands, are restoring religion every where, in defiance of opposition. In all parts, the monasteries are levelled with the ground. The theatrical dresses, the sacrilegious chalices, the images, the altars—all are consigned to the flames. Not a vestige of the ancient superstition and idolatry is left. We have all heard of *drinking like a Scythian*. But this is to *church it like a Scythian*!—pp. 68, 69.

From the conclusion of this letter it appears that Jewel was already marked out for the Bishopric of Salisbury, and previously to his Consecration he fulfilled the early anticipation of Parkhurst, and preached with great effect at Paul's Cross. It was not till the 21st of January, 1560, that he received the Mitre; and his mind, in the interim, seems to have been much more fully occupied about the non-essential of rites and ceremonies, than the above extract from his Correspondence, and some of his former Diocesan administrations, would induce us to suspect was likely. That Mr. Le Bas should write well and wisely respecting the fastidious aversion "from decent ritual solemnities and a becoming clerical costume," which the abuse of them had awakened in the XVth Century, is not more than was to be ex-

pected. But we rejoice to perceive that Peter Martyr did not by any means think that they furnished grounds for "unseemly contention;" and that, while rejecting Altars and Images, and all other puppetry which could minister to superstition, he recommended acquiescence in matters indifferent. "We have here," says Mr. Le Bas, while summing up the argument which Martyr employed,

"the counsels of a man whose prepossessions were, obviously, in favour of what he imagined to be the primitive simplicity of Christian worship; whose conscience, or (if we may so express it), whose religious taste, revolted against every thing which savoured, however slightly, of Papal corruption; but who, nevertheless, abstains from any incendiary suggestions, by which the peace of our Church might be endangered. Images and crucifixes are to be sternly put away. Habits, and ceremonies, and customs, to be thoroughly reformed, *if practicable*. But, at all events, there must be no violent opposition to authority; no hasty or petulant rejection of office; no abandonment of the ministry on account of unessential matters; nothing, in short, which could expose the cause of truth to the perils of unseemly and uncharitable strife. Who can believe, that, if Martyr had been finally settled and naturalized in England, he would ever have joined the faction which tore the Church in pieces, and scattered the deadly seeds of anarchy and confusion? And who can forbear to wish that a double portion of his spirit had fallen upon the men, who achieved the bad eminence of heading the insurrection?"—pp. 85, 86.

The See of Salisbury was among those which had suffered most heavily from the rapacity of a Papal occupant. Of his immediate predecessor Jewel had too good occasion to remark, that "Capon had devoured all!" Nevertheless, he found means to exercise a liberal hospitality, and to appropriate large sums to purposes of charity. In a Sermon at Paul's Cross, preached on the second Sunday before Easter, in the year of his Consecration, he offered to maintain twenty-seven Propositions against the adherents of Rome. They related to the vital differences between the two Churches; and he defied his adversaries "to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor or Father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitive Church, whereby it (any one of the Propositions which he recited) may be clearly and plainly proved." The challenge led to a skirmishing correspondence with Dr. Henry Cole, the Ex-Dean of St. Paul's, who soon discovered that he was overmatched, and became discreetly silent. The Propositions were afterwards expanded, and form that celebrated *Apologia Ecclesie Anglicane*, upon which the high reputation of Jewel has continued to exist even to our own times, which was published with the consent of the Bishops, and

has always been understood to speak the sense of the whole Church, in whose name it is written.*

Upon a Tract so well-known and so easily accessible, detailing the grounds of our separation with so much clearness of argument, and so much elegance of language, as characterizes this celebrated *Apology*, it is quite needless that we should dwell. It is familiar to every *tyro* in Divinity, and nevertheless, it furnishes weapons which the veteran must not disdain to employ. It excited speedy and universal attention, and called forth the most unqualified praise from all Protestant Europe. Martyr hailed its author as *parens illustris et elegantis filii*; he said that it not only satisfied himself *omnibus modis et numeris*, but that it appeared to Bullinger, his sons, and his sons in law, to Guceter and Wolfius, *tam sapiens, mirabilis et eloquens, ut ejus laudanda nullum modum faciant, nec arbitrantur hoc tempore quicquam perfectius editum fuisse*. The letter closes with a brief allusion to bodily infirmities which, ere long, were to deprive the Reformed Church of one of its brightest ornaments. Martyr died in the 63d year of his age, on Nov. 12, 1562. His history is thus briefly given by Mr. Le Bas.

“This distinguished champion of the Reformation was by birth a Florentine. His family name was Vermilio. He very early acquired the fame of an accomplished scholar and divine. When he had reached his sixteenth year, he became a regular Augustine in the monastery of Fiesole. His reputation at length promoted him to the post of Abbot of Spoleto; in which he was distinguished for his successful activity in rectifying the disorders and abuses which had crept into the monastic societies within his charge. About this time his faith was unsettled by a fearless study of the Scriptures, and by the writings of the Protestant divines. He subsequently embraced the Reformed doctrines, abandoned his preferment and his country; married a nun who had left her convent; and in the time of Edward VI. was invited over to England, where he was advanced to the Divinity chair at Oxford, in 1549.”—pp. 121, 122.

The *Apology* was soon translated into most of the living languages of Europe—into Italian, French, Spanish, German, Dutch, Greek and Welsh. It was *censured* by the Council of Trent, which assembly authorized two Divines to prepare an answer to it; an order more readily issued than obeyed, for the embryo Reply, if ever conceived, certainly never came to the birth. An English version, in which Archbishop Parker is supposed to have taken considerable share, appeared simultaneously with the original Latin; but a fuller and more perfect translation was executed two years afterwards, by a female pen. Lady Anne Bacon, wife of the illustrious Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas, submitted this

* Preface to Bishop Randolph's *Enchiridion Theologicum*, p. 5.

her Work to the Primate and to Jewel himself, the latter of whom she addressed in a Greek letter. Both of them returned the MS. professing that they had not to suggest the alteration of a single word; and with the delicate, yet substantial compliment, that "to prevent such excuses as her modesty would have made in staying the publication, what she had sent *written*, they, with hearty thanks, sent it back *printed*." The Lady thus honoured, and deserving of honour, was not unworthy to be the mother of the immortal writer of the *Notum Organon*.

The gauntlet thrown down by Jewel was frequently taken up, and the *crabrones* incessantly buzzed about his ears. But he had measured his strength accurately, before he ventured upon the conflict, and he was fearless of the stings which menaced him. Dorman, Cope, Sanders, Stapleton, Rastal, Heskins, and others equally forgotten, were insufficient to arouse him, and he did not take the trouble even of brushing them away. One opponent, Thomas Harding, persisted till he was crushed. Harding, as it suited his interest, had alternately been Papist and Protestant; in one word, which may suffice to convey a notion of his character, he had at first been Chaplain to Lady Jane Grey, and afterwards Confessor to Bishop Gardiner. Mr. Le Bas' clear narrative of the controversy which he provoked, demands extraction.

"Such was the man who came forward to bear the chief brunt of the encounter with the great Apologist of our Church. Tainted as he was with the infamy of his recent defection from the reformed faith, he, yet, appeared before the world with an undaunted front. His first adventure, however, was not an attack upon the Apology itself. He was first called forth by the challenge pronounced by Jewel from St. Paul's Cross, in the Lent of 1560. The 'Answer' of Harding to that defiance was put forth in January, 1563; and was followed, in about two years and a half, by the Bishop's 'Reply,' which appeared in August, 1565, and produced a rejoinder from Harding. A few months, however, before the publication of this 'Reply,' Harding had been again in the field; for his principal work, the 'Confutation of a Book called an Apology for the Church of England,' had come forth in April, 1565. The 'Confutation' again gave rise to Jewel's grand performance, the 'Defence of the Apology'; of which the first edition appeared in October, 1567. In the course of the next year, 1568, Harding came forth again with a collection of cavils against the Bishop's 'Defence.' To this performance he prefixed the following lengthy and scurrilous title: — 'A Detection of sundry foul Errors, Lies, Slanders, Corruptions, and other false Dealings, touching Doctrine, and other Matters, uttered and practised by Mr. Jewel, in a Book lately by him set forth, entitled, a Defence of the Apology, &c.'" The work, however, was not of sufficient importance to demand a distinct publication in answer to it. Jewel accordingly delayed all notice of this 'Detection' till the appearance of

the second impression of the 'Defence.' This impression was completed in December, 1569, together with a preface, in which the despicable fatuity of Harding's 'Detection' is calmly, but most triumphantly, exposed. The 'Defence,' at its first publication, was accompanied by an Epistle to the Queen; which, of itself, was a sufficient refutation of the falsehoods then circulated by the friends of Harding; namely, that the works of Jewel were published without the Royal sanction; and that her Majesty was displeased with him for disturbing the world with his controversial writings.

"Nothing, of course, could be more utterly hopeless than the attempt to convey to the reader, in a few words or sentences, any clear conception of the merits of this voluminous controversy; which embraces almost every important point in debate between the Church of Rome and the Church of England. Our notice of the conflict must, in this place at least, be purely historical. We shall, therefore, for the present, be satisfied with observing, that the dispute was conducted by Jewel in a spirit of perfect fairness and integrity. The method observed by him is precisely similar to that which was followed by Archbishop Crammer in his controversy with Gardiner, relative to the Sacramental Doctrine. The paragraphs, or passages, from Harding's books are always printed immediately before the answers to them. The performance of his adversary is thus incorporated with his own; and the reader is enabled, with entire convenience, to compare the disputants with each other. It may further be mentioned that Jewel maintains, throughout, the serenity and self-possession which indicate a perfect mastery over his subject. There is no exhibition of petulance or irritation; no symptom of conscious weakness; nothing of the agitation by which men sometimes betray a want of confidence either in the goodness of their cause, or in their own capacity to do it justice. Every one who studies this controversy must arise from it with a persuasion, that the learned Bishop Reynolds said no more than the truth, when he affirmed that Harding was 'no more able to subsist under the hand of his renowned and incomparable antagonist, than a whelp under the paw of a lion.'"—pp. 144—146.

And again, in the Ninth Chapter, which is almost exclusively devoted to a Review of the Challenge and the Controversy with Harding.

"With respect to the controversy itself, it is extremely important to remark the principles on which it is conducted by Jewel. The reader may, perhaps, have been almost tempted to infer from several passages in his history, that he brought back with him from the continent nothing but the general spirit of *Protestantism*; and that he left behind him the peculiar spirit of the Church of England. A more attentive consideration of those passages must satisfy us that this was not the case. It is true that he was in constant trepidation lest anything should be preserved which might restore to the ancient corruptions their hold upon the public mind. And hence it was that, for some time, he was anxious that the Church should throw aside certain rites and usages, which were thought by many to savour too rankly of Romish superstition, and which seemed to threaten the Establishment with the miseries of discord and

confusion. But it is quite indisputable that his readiness to concede was confined to matters purely superficial, and, in their own nature, indifferent. That, in every essential question, he was faithful to the principles of the *English* Reformation, as distinguished from those which governed most of the Reformers of the continent, is clear from the whole tenor of his dispute with Harding. For he does not content himself with saying to his adversaries, 'I defy you to find Romanism in the Bible.' He goes further, and says, 'I defy you to find it in the first six centuries: I defy you to uphold it by the authority of the earliest interpreters of the Bible; I defy you to establish it by the consent of those who, in primitive times, bare witness to the truth.' Now, in doing this, he was true to the peculiar genius of our Anglo-Catholic Church. Most other Protestant communities send every individual to the Bible alone; there to exercise his own private judgment, without reference to the judgment of primitive and Catholic antiquity. The Church of Rome, on the contrary, sends her children to an infallible and living guide, whose prerogative it is to expound the *written* and *unwritten* word,—to interpret the Oracles both of Scripture and of Tradition. Whereas, the Church of England, on the one hand, acknowledges no authority as co-ordinate with the authority of the Bible; but on the other hand, in determining the sense of the Bible, she listens with respect to the voice of the most ancient Fathers and Doctors; and not only with respect, but even with submission, where that voice is all but unanimous."—pp. 256, 257.

Oxford conferred the Degree of D.D. upon the Bishop in 1565, and he presided as Moderator in the Divinity Schools during the celebrated visit which the Queen paid to his University. His Diocese was much disturbed by the itinerant Preachers whom the Primate had been induced to licence with the vain hope that they might assist in removing the dearth of spiritual bread under which the Kingdom laboured. The experiment failed; the vagabond Prophets became meddlers and busybodies, thrusting their sickle into other men's harvests, reaping where they had not sown, and increasing the confusion which they were intended to diminish. To the danger arising from these worthy successors of the Mendicants, and latterly to that occasioned by the Non-conforming Puritans, Bishop Jewel was keenly alive; and his opinions have called out some sound observations from Mr. Le Bas.

"By these men, and men of the same stamp, the true spirit of our Reformation appears to have been well nigh forgotten. It never was the intent of our original Reformers to present the Church of England to the public mind under the aspect of a new establishment, substituted in the place of an old one which had been subverted and demolished. The Church of England, to which all their toils and cares were devoted, was the very same Church which had existed from the beginning; and their object was not to sweep it from the face of the earth, and to plant another on its site; but to cleanse it from superstitious corruptions, and

to effect its deliverance from a shameful servitude. Conformably to these views, it was their desire, as nearly as they could without any compromise of principle, to assimilate the exterior of religion to what it had been in the days of Romanism ; and so, to avoid the needless exhibition of a repulsive contrast between the imposing solemnities of the ancient worship, and the dreary meanness and poverty of the new."—p. 164.

"It has sometimes been lamented that matters of this description were not left to private discretion. A few indifferent usages, it is said, might have been retained, for a time, in order to soften the aspect of religious innovation ; but this should have been no more than a temporary policy ; and, after a time, it would have been prudent to relax the offensive regulations. In other words, it became the state and the hierarchy to propitiate the Roman Catholics by the preservation of certain exterior solemnities of religion ; but to cast them away to the moles and the bats, the instant the Non-conformists became sufficiently clamorous and insolent ! The inevitable consequence of this sort of liberality would have been, to exhibit the Church of England, habited in such a motley collection of shreds and patches, as to invite the scorn of the whole world. There never yet was a religious community known to tolerate such unseemly anomalies within its own pale ; and it is beyond measure astonishing that any one, who did not desire to see religion made utterly ridiculous, should be anxious to behold such indecent confusion, either established by authority, or endured by connivance. Did it never occur to the scrupulous party, that, in the change or retrenchment of externals, the Church must stop somewhere?—that, without exposing herself to general derision, she cannot be *perpetually* altering the visible fashion of her worship, to suit the varying caprices of self-willed and discontented men?—and that, if she is to provide for edification, she must think of edifying, not merely a portion of the people, but the great majority of those in communion with her ? And did they not know, that, if there were some who thought the service of God encumbered by certain useless remnants of Papistry, there was a vastly greater number who thought that even more of the outward form and comeliness of religion might have been usefully and beneficially retained ?"—p. 167.

The Bull of deprivation issued by Pius V. in 1570, and which Felton had the daring to affix to the Palace-gates of the Bishop of London, was immediately reviewed by Jewel ; and he showed with temper, but with spirit, the arrogance of that pretension by which an Italian Bishop pronounced an independent Sovereign to be a usurper, removed her from a throne which she had already occupied during twelve years, and openly excited her subjects to Treason. The only text upon which the Pontiff rested his claim was Jeremiah, i. 10. "See I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down ; to build and to plant." The reasoning of the Pope, as Mr. Le Bas observes, must have been framed in the following manner. "The Prophet

Jeremiah was appointed to announce the ruin which was hanging over those kingdoms whose sins had ripened them for destruction; *therefore* the Patriarch of Rome is empowered to absolve subjects from their obedience, and to declare their Rulers to be usurpers and outcasts."

One of the more commendable exercises of private benevolence during the time in which Jewel flourished, was the maintenance at the University of students whose humble parentage and contracted means, without such aid, would ever have been a bar to the full display of their abilities; and it fell to the lot of this exemplary Prelate to be instrumental in kindling one of the most burning and shining lights which have shed brightness upon our Church. Richard Hooker was entered at Corpus in 1567, chiefly by the support of a pension assigned to him by Jewel. The following anecdote is worthy of preservation, as a companion to that which we have before extracted of Bishop Parkhurst, and it is borrowed from Izaak Walton's *Life of the great author of the Ecclesiastical Polity*.

"After having been about four years at Oxford, Richard Hooker went on foot to visit his mother at Exeter; and, on his way thither, he travelled by Salisbury, for the express purpose of visiting his kind patron and benefactor. Both he and another youth from Oxford, who was the companion of his journey, were invited to the bishop's table—an honour which was always proudly and gratefully remembered by Hooker. On his departure, the bishop furnished him with abundance of good counsel, and, moreover, gave him his benediction; but, by mere inadvertence, forgot to provide him with any other facilities for his journey to Exeter. The seeming unkindness, however, was soon repaired. The moment the bishop recollected his omission, he sent a servant to overtake Richard with all possible speed, and to bring him back. On his return, the bishop, with singular considerateness for the feelings of a humble youth, forbore to begin by any allusion to the immediate purpose for which he had recalled him, but addressed him thus:—'Richard, I sent for you back, to lend you a horse, which hath carried me many a mile; and, I thank God, with much ease.' And here he put into Richard's hand a walking-staff, with which he professed that he had travelled through many parts of Germany—a circumstance which might well reconcile the young man to the labour and tediousness of pedestrian travel. 'And, Richard,' continued the bishop, 'I do not give, but lend, you mine horse. Be sure you be honest, and bring my horse back to me, at your return this way to Oxford. And I do give you ten groats to bear your charges to Exeter. And here is ten groats more, which I charge you to deliver to your mother; and tell her that I send a bishop's benediction with it; and beg a continuance of her prayers for me. And if you bring my horse back to me, I will give you ten groats more, to carry you on foot to the College. And so, God bless you, good Richard.'"—p. 207—209.

"Good Richard," alas, had scarcely reached Oxford before his friend had ceased to live. He died on June 23, 1571, at Monkton Farley in Wiltshire, worn down by the fatigues of a Visitation, before he had completed his fiftieth year. Fuller's quaint antithesis, that "it is hard to say whether his soul or his ejaculation arrived first in Heaven, seeing he prayed dying and died praying," may perhaps have borne allusion to an answer which Jewel is reported to have made to a Gentleman who remonstrated with him on the hazard which he encountered by preaching while labouring under great and manifest bodily weakness. To the argument, that it would be better for the people to be disappointed of one sermon than to be finally deprived of such a Preacher, he replied that it well became a Bishop to die in the pulpit. Fuller also eulogized him in some lines, which, however tinctured by the conceits from which no contemporary verse was altogether free, have enough beauty, and quite enough truth, to justify us in the insertion of them.

"Holy Learning, sacred arts,
Gifts of Nature, strength of parts,
Fluent grace, a humble mind,
Worth reformed and Wit refined,
Sweetness both in tongue and pen,
Insight both in books and men,
Hopes in woe, and fears in weal,
Humble knowledge, sprightly zeal,
A liberal heart and free from gall,
Close to friend and true to all,
Height of courage in Truth's duel,
Are the stones that made this JEWEL.
Let him that would be truly blest,
Wear this JEWEL in his breast."

Laurence Humphrey, the President of Magdalen College, was selected by the Primate and by the Bishop of London as a Biographer fitted to do justice to the memory of Jewel; and the simplicity of heart with which that Divine executed his task is ever to be recorded to his honour. Not many years had passed since Jewel had opposed, apparently had frustrated, some hope of preferment entertained by Humphrey, who had refused to wear either the cap or the surplice. Jewel was his friend, but he did not on that account scruple to remonstrate with him sharply "in respect to his vain contention about apparel;" and he moreover informed the Archbishop, that since the recusant's long suffering had given great offence, "he minded not in anywise to receive him." Humphrey, however, completed a narrative described by Mr. Le Bas to be "not very remarkable for lucid arrangement or correct taste;" to be "rambling, disorderly and imperfect;" but which

nevertheless is "admirable for the cordiality with which it enters into the essential and transcendent merits of the champion of our Church." A *Memoir of the Bishop's Life* by Daniel Featly is prefixed to the Edition of his Works in 1609; and another by "a Person of Quality," (a convenient title assumed by many anonymous writers about two Centuries ago,) originally printed with a Translation of the Bishop's Letter to Signor Leti, has been reprinted in the Fourth Volume of Dr. Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Biography*. Much, however, was left for a new writer, and that much has been ably performed by Mr. Le Bas.

The last two chapters, the most valuable in the little volume before us, contain a summary review of Bishop Jewel's Writings, but they manifestly defy abridgement. The criticisms are marked by a very nice discrimination, and are singularly free from the sin by which Biographers for the most part are too easily beset—a belief that every opinion which flows from the Hero of the Tale, is a true account to be maintained as irrefragable. Mr. Le Bas has not hesitated to denounce the fallacy of some doctrines which Bishop Jewel asserted respecting the receipt of Interest for money, or, as in those days it was termed, Usury.

"It would require a treatise to examine and to answer these formidable positions of Bishop Jewel, and no labour, probably, could be more entirely superfluous. If, indeed, it be once admitted, that the practice of taking any payment whatever, under any circumstances, for the use of money, has been strictly prohibited, not merely to the Israelites, but to every other nation under heaven, then,—all argument upon the question must be nugatory. In that case, we should, of course, be under a sacred obligation to abstain from every thing in the shape of interest, as from the touch of an accursed thing. It might, indeed, be difficult for us to perceive why personal property should, in this respect, be placed, for ever, under an interdict, from which landed or real property is exempt. But, nevertheless, if it were so written in the Scriptures of God, it would be our duty, not to reason, but simply to obey. It seems, however, that since the days of Jewel, the whole world, as it were with one consent, have given a different interpretation from his, to the words both of the Old Testament and the New, relative to the lending either of money, or of other things. And if that interpretation should be wrong, it is positively terrific to reflect upon the length, and breadth, and depth, of error and crime, in which the whole structure of modern society has its foundation,—more especially in this land! But whether it be right or wrong, the denunciations of this faithful and venerable man will still speak, in all their solemnity and power, to those who convert the rights of property into instruments of oppression; or who harden their faces and their hearts against the miseries of the indigent. Nothing that Jewel has said in condemnation of usury, can be too severe for those who carry an usurious and rapacious spirit into all the transactions of life. Even if the receipt of interest be *not* forbidden, the

immoderate and merciless exaction of it unquestionably is forbidden. And though the laws of man may be unable to reach them who forget this, the law of God will assuredly find them out; and the bitterest things that are written therein will be their portion."—pp. 333, 334.

The volume is an agreeable addition to our stores of Ecclesiastical History, and the eminent reputation of Mr. Le Bas permits us to add, that by being composed in a more easy and familiar tone than some of the Lives which he has formerly published, it appears to us better calculated for Biographical purposes.

ART. IV.—1. *Assemblée Générale de la Société Evangélique de Genève tenue le 30 Avril et le 1^{er} Mai, 1834, à l'Oratoire. (Troisième Anniversaire).*

2. *La Voix de l'Eglise une sous toutes les formes successives du Christianisme.* Par J. H. Merle d'Aubigné. Edit. Genève et Paris. 1834.

So very little practical benefit in matters civil or religious has arisen of late years from plausible and ingenious theories, that the age appears to us to have become mistrustful of them altogether, and we are glad to see a better method gradually introducing itself of recommending or resisting any proposed alteration in our institutions; we mean,—by an appeal to facts or tried experiments. The clamours, which have lately been raised against the “exclusive character” of the Church of England and the two Universities, derived their fleeting consistence from the plausible theory of “liberty of conscience in all matters of religion;” but this maxim, which the Church of England adopted long before any organized system of religious dissension in our land, should have been coupled with another, viz., that every institution must have rules and regulations for its own preservation. Liberty of conscience consists in allowing the individual to choose the institution to which he conscientiously thinks he ought to adhere, without being subject to any penalties of the civil law; but, having made his choice, it surely forms no part of his liberty of conscience to have the power of breaking open the door of another institution which he has conscientiously abandoned. He is therefore reduced to take his stand upon a theory more vague than any other, viz., that all religious distinctions should cease, and all institutions of that nature be allowed to blend their peculiarities in one common stock; or, in other words, that all rules and regulations, but especially creeds, should be set aside. It would not indeed be difficult to maintain a popular argument grounded upon this proposition; but the defect of it would be—the want

of a practical demonstration that such an experiment had ever succeeded; and, whilst on the other hand we could point out innumerable instances in which the attempt had not only failed, but brought destruction on the institutions themselves, the defenders of such "liberal" systems would not be able to produce a single example where practical good had resulted from them.

The Church of Geneva, to which our attention has lately been directed by some publications sent to England from that city, (the titles of two of which we have placed at the head of this article,) affords at this moment a signal but lamentable proof of the impracticability of a system such as some of our dissenting brethren have recently endeavoured to maintain; and we firmly believe that many of them, if they could compare the issue of such a generalizing system, if carried into effect, with their present views of the Christian faith, would be horror-struck at the work of their own hands. They would complain as bitterly of the fruits of their own doings as they now complain of similar doings of others, when they see upwards of (100?) chapels in England, originally founded for purposes of which they are well aware, now in the hands of those, who, whether right or wrong in the abstract, are certainly removed into another gospel. These considerations have induced us to give a succinct account of the state of religion in the celebrated city of Calvin: a state at which the ministers of the National Church have arrived by the abolition of those creeds and safeguards which defended their Zion for two centuries; but which, when neglected by indifference, or swept away by the philosophy of the age, allowed the edifice to fall in ruins; until her very children have at length been moved to see her in the dust, and taken pity on the stones thereof.

For two centuries after the Reformation the Genevans made use of a catechism which went under the name of Calvin, and they had also a liturgy which is partially used at this day. They adopted the Helvetic Confession of Faith, which differs but little from the famous Confession of Augsburg, and is for the most part in harmony with the doctrines contained in the Articles of the Church of England. These formularies, as long as they were faithfully used, served to shield the leading doctrines of the Reformation from any overt attacks from without, and secure them from degeneracy within. The Helvetic creed began to fall into disuse about the middle of the last century, and not long afterwards the students in divinity were permitted to maintain Arian Theses. Some of these, in an objectionable form, were held when Professor Vernet occupied the theological chair, about fifteen years before the breaking out of the French Revolution; and it is sufficiently clear, from the writings of Voltaire and the

letters of Jean Jacques Rousseau, that the doctrines of the Reformation were no longer held by a large majority of the Genevan clergy.* How far those two philosophers may have contributed to achieve the ruin of the faith we know not. The Genevan Rousseau taunts the pastors of the flocks with their indecision; and almost calls upon them to declare whether they acknowledged the divinity of Christ or not. And it appears from the general tenor of his letters that the bewildered pastors were as reluctant to make any open avowal of their faith as they are at this day. Their creed then, as it is now, was a negative one; they never stated what they believed, but only answered to the interrogatories of others what they believed not; and by never appealing to the ancient creed which their forefathers had adopted, they gave the world to understand that it was no longer one of their formularies. The liturgy, however, and the catechism of Calvin were still retained; and in this state the French Revolution found the Church of Geneva, and in this state it may be said to have left it.

After the restoration of the republic in 1814, some time was necessarily required for remodelling the institutions. Geneva, with its increase of territory, was annexed to the Helvetic Confederation, and the ancient creed of the Swiss Churches was yet received in many of the cantons. In the canton of Vaud especially were remaining many traces of genuine piety. The National Church had not followed the example of the neighbouring republic; and it may be presumed that, as the former separation had saved Lausanne from the Arianism of Geneva, so now the federal union of those two contiguous cantons contributed to the revival of the ancient faith in the city of Calvin. We do not pretend to know precisely the degree of intercourse which Messrs. Malan, Bost, and some others, who first protested against the errors of the National Church, may have had with their neighbouring brethren; but we strongly suspect that their torch was lighted at the embers of piety which yet burned in the Pays de Vaud† and the Canton of Berne. The Venerable Company of pastors, not agreeing upon any one point of Christian doctrine, were almost unanimous in this,—that there should be full and free admission into their corps for all sorts of opinions, and that no candidate for the holy ministry should be rejected on account of his theological faith. And such care was taken to obviate all difficulties of this kind, that the examining “Faculty of Theology” did not even presume to express an opinion upon the *doctrines* set forth in the Theses of candidates. The following is the form now used on

* See on this subject, the Christian Advocate's recent publication.

† The Reformation came originally to Geneva from the Pays de Vaud, brought by Farel, Froment, Theodore of Beza, &c.

such occasions : “ La Faculté de Théologie, après avoir vu les présentes Thèses, en permet l'impression, sans entendre par là exprimer d'opinion sur les propositions qui y sont énoncées.

“ Genève, le 17 Avril, 1830.

“ Vaucher,

“ Doyen de la Faculté.”

Here then we have an example of the most “ enlarged toleration” that was ever exhibited in a Christian community; and such as no sect or denomination of Christians in our country could ever boast of. For if even a candidate for the ministry should present himself at the door of a Unitarian synod, and declare his belief in the divinity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, he would surely be rejected; and we need not add that, in the absence of such declaration, he would be rejected by the Established Church of England. But the National Church of Geneva in the nineteenth century would hear of no such distinctions; the Arian and the Socinian and the Trinitarian were to sit together in peace, without impugning or even mentioning one another's creeds. This was considered the perfection of ecclesiastical polity, and was to become an example to the Churches of the nineteenth, as Geneva had been once before in the sixteenth century. Some of the acute members of the venerable body, and some of the consistory also, with the great historian of the age (Sismondi) at their head, pleaded in behalf of the rights of conscience, and triumphantly declared (for there was no one to oppose them) that the human conscience could not be fettered by creeds; and that by imposing upon an individual any form of words to which he assented, but with *mental reservation*, was the proper way to make hypocrites. Our readers will easily perceive that, as the Venerable Company could not frame a confession of faith which any two of them would sign, they were necessarily thrown upon this expedient; and if, when duly acted upon, it had secured peace within and respect from without, it might fairly have been offered as a model of church government to other Christian communities. But it secured neither; and although it has scarcely been fifteen years in operation, it has produced in a city of about 24,000 inhabitants no less than three distinct and independent religious communities; that is to say, taking the number of 24,000 souls, the enlightened and unlimited toleration of the modern Church of Geneva has been productive of more dissent (and we may add religious bickerings) in fifteen years, than the Church of England, in its “ exclusive character,” has produced in three centuries. But every minister in that national church was allowed to follow the dictates of his conscience, and could by no means be excluded. What will our readers say to the fact which it is our duty now to state,—that

out of a body of thirty ministers, five pious godly men have been excluded with ecclesiastical censure within twelve years? This is one in six within twelve years; so that, if the Church of England had adopted twelve years ago a tone of "toleration," like that of the Unitarian Church of Geneva, several hundreds of her clergy would now have been begging their bread, unless they had found a precarious support in dissenting congregations. As a partial revival of the old faith has been the result of those exclusions, (in which we are willing to recognize an over-ruling Providence,) it may not be uninteresting to recount the transactions which have led to the present state of things.

Scarcely had the venerable assembly proclaimed its universal good will towards men of all opinions, when the theory was disturbed by a practical illustration. A minister, holding the humble situation of a class-teacher ("regent"),—one, which did not entitle him to have a voice in the synod,—began to preach "a new doctrine." That doctrine might indeed have been found in the Helvetic Confession of Faith, or in the Catechism of Calvin, or in any creed of the reformed churches of Germany; but it was generally declared by the affrighted pastors to be a novelty. M. C sar Malan, the "regent," continued to attract large audiences wherever he preached; and this, joined to the kind of instruction he was daily instilling into the "Fifth Class," alarmed the venerable academical company of pastors. The Catechism of Calvin, having now passed through the crucible of twenty different views of Christian faith, had lost all the essence of the Reformation. The process of its purification may remind us of the bald man in the fable, and in its present form we are convinced that the Sultan Mahmoud might sign it without any compromise of principle. But, as it was a text book imposed upon the regents of classes by the authority of the ecclesiastical body, it was necessary for them to make use of it. We cannot wonder that M. Malan, with his new notions of revealed truth, should often depart from the letter, and instruct his class in the more essential points of Christian doctrine. For this, however, he was called to account; and the accusation against him was increased by his having made strong allusions in his public discourses to the errors of Arianism and the degeneracy of the faith at Geneva. The new champion for the orthodox faith was required to abstain in future from all such observations in the pulpit, and to teach his class religion out of the purified catechism alone. It was easy to see whither this controversy was likely to tend. Towards the close of the year 1818, M. Malan was deposed from his office of regent, and the "toleration" act of the Venerable Company was ratified by the civil authorities. The use of the pulpit was also interdicted to him in all the churches of the

canton. We are not now concerned in arraigning the decision of the Venerable Company. The ex-regent might complain with some reason of the illegality of his sentence, and the National Church might with equal reason allege the necessity of upholding its authority over a refractory minister; an authority, without doubt, essential to its very existence. But, however these things might be argued, the case had fully exemplified the impracticability of the system with which the "tolerant" church had set out. M. Malan, being now thrown upon the wide world, had to seek support for himself and his family from his fellow Christians in foreign lands; and no sooner was the case made known in England, than he received numerous tokens of sympathy. He was considered as a persecuted member of Christ's church; as the man of God who had combated single-handed the Arian and Socinian errors of the fallen Church of Calvin; and in a little time he was enabled to erect a chapel at the gates of Geneva, and dedicate his time and talents to the cause he had espoused. His worldly prosperity excited the envy of some of his neighbours, and malicious whispers went abroad that he had made a trade of his religion. That he was amply recompensed for the loss of his salary as "regent" there can be no doubt; but that he was influenced by any worldly motives in raising the standard of Calvin once more in his native city, we do not believe. We are not inclined to become the apologists of all his subsequent acts, nor the defenders of all his doctrines; we fancy that we sometimes see in them a disposition to proclaim "*aut Caesar aut nullus*;" but we feel it our duty to acknowledge his persevering efforts for maintaining the essential points of our faith, and many of our countrymen, visiting Geneva, have derived benefit from his instructions. His congregation at the *Prè l'Eveque* consists of about 100 persons, chiefly of the poorer classes, and his support must now be derived from the precarious donations of a few strangers.

The religious assemblies, which were at first held by the deposed minister and his adherents, were liable to be disturbed by the mob, which gathered nightly around the dwelling; but, whatever insults were offered by the rabble, we must do the civil authorities the justice to say, that prompt measures were taken to put a stop to them. The government of Geneva does in fact, what the Venerable Company does in theory. It grants to every man, according to his choice or conscience, the full and free exercise of his religion. The persecution of M. Malan, therefore, begins and ends with his deposition. The next victim of religious toleration was the pious minister Bost. We recollect perusing his defence before the council with great interest; yet, although his case excited more sympathy among his fellow citizens than that of M.

Malan had done, it hardly ever reached the ears of the benevolent stranger. M. Bost modestly retired to the bosom of his family, after pleading his cause in vain. He became an itinerant preacher, and found some temporary support in the neighbouring cantons. He is the author of some works of great merit. With a conscience void of offence, and endued with indefatigable zeal, he has gone through some years of penury, and we fear is now verging to absolute want. It would be a pleasure to us to hear of this good man being employed as a Missionary in some of those places in France, where a disposition has been manifested to listen to the doctrines of the Reformation.

The Church of Geneva was now assailed in foreign journals, and frequently appealed to as a warning to those who sat loose to creeds and formularies. Travellers and religious tourists brought home and published their partial views on the state of religion at Geneva; and in comparing the statements of such writers as Mr. Bakewell and Dr. Pye Smith, we confess that we were totally unable to form any decided opinion upon the subject. Nor was there any tangible form in which the creed of the Venerable Company could be either impugned or recommended. Like Proteus, it escaped from every attempt to catch its shape. If the pastors were arraigned for their departure from the orthodox faith, they could immediately put forward four or five of their body who acknowledged the doctrine of the Trinity, and all things consequent thereupon. If accused by the Unitarians of our own country of their want of philosophy, they could appeal to the writings of their Professor of Divinity, and to their "rational method" of expounding the sacred volume in their Academy. A volume of sermons, published in London by the Rev. S. Pons, only served to mislead those persons who had no opportunity of verifying the facts as to the sentiments of the Genevan clergy. The editor of this book, himself a minister of the Church of England, and a native of Geneva, must have been well aware that those sermons obtained in manuscripts from some few of the pastors, including one of M. Gaussen, (now become the leader of the Trinitarian party,) by no means represented the real state of the case. For either the sermons were upon general subjects, which afforded no test of theological faith, or else they were written by ministers avowedly orthodox. But the religious world was not long left in doubt as to the sentiments of the majority of the venerable body, when the works of the Professor of Divinity began to circulate. M. Chenevière, the Professor, with a frankness which belongs to his character, resolved to publish his own opinions, at least, to the world, at the same time that he defended the conduct of the National Church in the case of M. Malan. The Professor

unfolded five causes which had hitherto retarded the progress of the Reformation, and amongst them he enumerated "Methodism" as one. But the Professor's Methodism consisted partly in a belief of the Trinity and the doctrine of the Atonement. These Methodists, observes the teacher of divinity, sitting in the chair of Calvin and Beza, must need represent God as being angry with his creatures; and to appease that anger he must have blood! It is true that several of the pastors, even of those who denied Christ's divinity, disapproved of these sentiments of their Professor; and many, dissatisfied with the five causes in general, as linked with a defence of their discipline, were ready to exclaim "*non tali auxilio*:" some, indeed, were disposed to advise the Professor, on whose frankness and good nature they could rely, that, if his work on the five causes of retardation, &c. should reach a second edition, he should add a sixth cause, viz. his own book. But the second edition never appeared, although we find copies of the first very scarce. We do not, indeed, suppose that M. Chenevière meant all he said in his first publications; but his zeal for the Academy and the National Church, joined to his sovereign contempt for the "Methodists," led him to assail for a moment what he had not then lost all respect for. His more recent publications, however, will set him free from all suspicions of that nature. He has written one treatise, comprising much learning, against the system of the Trinitarians; a second against the doctrine of original sin; and a third, which really appears to us to be against faith in general. The first of these essays was answered by M. Malan, in a work of considerable merit, defending the doctrine of Christ's divinity; but the citizens of Geneva must have read the title with some degree of astonishment, which was this—"Answer to the Professor of Divinity's Essay against the God of the Christians." However the sentiments of the Professor, as set forth in his writings, might be disapproved by his fellow-pastors, and we know they were disapproved by some, he still continued to occupy the theological chair; and this fact was considered by all foreign churches, who had looked with interest upon the preceding transactions, as decisive of the opinions of the majority. For however they might as critics have disapproved of the Professor's *manner* of writing, it was clear, since they left him in his high office, that they had no objection to the matter; and if any one had pleaded in his behalf the inviolability of their own principles, there was already the precedent, in M. Malan's case, for deposing a teacher. But if the public avowal of the Professor's sentiments might be considered only as a personal act, the rules laid down for the admission of candidates to the holy ministry was the act of the corps; and amongst those rules we

find the subjects of original sin, the divinity of Christ, and some others, prohibited. The peace of the Church, it was alleged, was the first thing to look to; and a great evil would arise if within such narrow limits as those of a single city, the pulpit should become the arena of controversy. We must leave our readers to judge whether the end justified the means; but it is fair to add, that when the Venerable Company was satisfied that the storm had abated, they took off the restrictions. It now required no more to prove these two things; first, that the National Church of Geneva was Unitarian; and secondly, that its liberal system could not be acted upon if it was to preserve its existence. But whilst these things were acting in the bosom of the National Church, a tempest was gathering over the heads of the leaders. The light was not entirely quenched, and several of the pastors, whilst they deplored the degeneracy of the faith, endeavoured in their respective vocations to counteract the evil. There were yet a few names even in the Venerable Company "that had not defiled their garments." M. Cellierier, sen. and M. Gaussen, had already republished the Helvetic Confession of Faith, and set their names to the doctrine contained in it; the pastor Deodati maintained the honour of his name; Messrs Galland, Coulin, and subsequently M. Thouron, the most eloquent of the Geneva preachers, adhered to the Trinitarian side. Pressed also from without by the unceasing efforts of M. Malan, (aided and abetted, as we are fully aware, by a great number of zealous persons in England,) together with a newly-established place of worship in the "Bourg du Four," the Venerable Company began to feel the danger which threatened its very existence; and it seemed to many of that respectable body to have become a paramount duty to watch narrowly the proceedings of every "Methodist" member. The flock in many instances was beforehand with the shepherd, and desired to be fed with meat which often could not be administered. The Trinitarian preachers (and this was one of the capital offences of the "Pasteur" of Satigny) were often unwilling to exchange their pulpits with the Arian or Socinian. Such exchanges are, however, part of the system of the Genevan clergy, whereby one sermon is made to suffice for three Sundays; so that the non-compliance of the Trinitarian, independently of the exclusive principle it implied, became in some instances a practical inconvenience. Contending upon this ground, the Arian preachers bore off in triumph the palm of "liberality;" for whilst they threw open the doors of their congregation to every species of teaching, the sturdy spirit of the orthodox* minister refused a reciprocity!

* We use this word for the purpose of designating that side of the question on which the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, Original Sin, &c. were upheld.

The bewildered flocks, one might think, deserved some consideration,—they at least had our sympathy; and doomed to look upon the contention of their chiefs, they might justly have said “*quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.*” But all these things very naturally contributed to render the Venerable Company more susceptible of any acts of rebellion against their authority. They had moreover to sustain the reiterated attacks of the “*Archives du Christianisme*” at Paris; the observations, sometimes not very accurate, of author-tourists; the reproaches which often appeared in the pages of religious journals in England and America: and, it must be confessed, that for some time they bore them all with stoical indifference. Yet many of them individually deplored the fate of their National Church,—put out, as it now seemed to be, of the pale of the reformed churches. Scotland no longer owned it as a mother; Holland rejected it as a sister; the very Church of the neighbouring Canton de Vaud refused its fellowship; and the Roman Catholics of Geneva, headed by their redoubtable chief M. le Curé Vuarins, began to gather about the carcase. The succeeding events, which we have yet to recount to our readers, infused new life into the flocks, and produced another convulsive throb in the agony of the Venerable Company.

With the principles of free toleration laid down by the ecclesiastical body, it was not possible to arraign any one of its members on account of doctrine, however odious it might be to individuals. Care was therefore taken to lay down a distinction between doctrine and discipline—a distinction by which the Pope of Rome frequently eludes the attacks of his adversaries. The Venerable Company had forgotten, or else they knew right well, that by imposing their lifeless catechism upon the parish minister, (if they had the right to impose it,) they had really involved doctrine and discipline in one. Now, we are far from accusing the venerable body of such a want of penetration that they did not see this; on the contrary, we think that they added to their penetration in making this distinction to supply the place of a confession of faith. Having clearly discerned that their house could not stand upon a foundation so large that it was slipping away like sand, they skilfully took this method of narrowing it; and now they may have got the means of keeping the fabric together for some time longer. But those means were borrowed from the very elements of those institutions on which they had undertaken to improve. They have in fact acknowledged the principle, that without rules, or creeds, or formularies, and those too of an exclusive nature, no institution in the Church (for we are not writing on state matters) can stand. Acting, therefore, upon this newly ingrafted principle, they soon found the means of deposing at one

blow three more of their body. M. Gaussen had been for many years minister of the parish of Satigny, a village situated at the extremity of the canton. His days were occupied in faithfully discharging the duties of a parish priest, and his secluded situation enabled him, as much as in him lay, to live peaceably with the Venerable Company. He was, indeed, chargeable with the offence of withholding the use of his pulpit from the preachers of "another Gospel;" but the general esteem and veneration in which he was held by his fellow-citizens, even by those who did not partake of his religious tenets, had secured him hitherto from ecclesiastical censure. Obligated to use the fatal catechism in instructing the children of his parish, he had adopted a method of using it similar to that introduced by M. Malan, that is, he put vigour into the lifeless text by constant reference to the Scriptures. Whatever might have been the duty of a regent of a class in submitting to the mandate of the company, the minister of a parish, in confining his religious instructions to expounding the Scriptures, was evidently set above their authority. For nothing more *was*, nor yet *is*, required of a candidate for the ministry, than a declaration that he will constantly adhere to the Scriptures. But the Venerable Company, having now become exceedingly jealous of its authority, soon espied in the proceedings of the Orthodox but "Methodist" pastor a cause for remonstrance. They, to whom all doctrines were indifferent, called M. Gaussen to order for his, under the name of discipline; and this produced a full and candid avowal of his sentiments, conveyed in a letter to the venerable body. There was nothing in that letter to provoke the anger of those ministers of peace and toleration, as many of them afterwards confessed; but they appear to have felt its force, as the doctors of another national Church felt the force of a more powerful appeal,—"In thus saying, thou reproachest us also." M. Gaussen was invited to withdraw his letter, as the condition of being restored to the favour of the Company, and for the sake of peace—a simple process with which M. Gaussen was willing to comply. But when it was privately intimated to him that such withdrawal of his letter would be considered as a retracting of his sentiments, he of course refused; and the consequence was, a temporary exclusion from the ecclesiastical sittings, with censure. It was not likely that a minister of M. Gaussen's high character could allow his fellow-citizens to remain in the dark as to the real nature of his alleged crime and public punishment; he therefore drew up an able and beautiful statement of his case, expounding the ecclesiastical laws of the canton, and showing the respective duties of the consistory and the body of pastors. This of course produced a reply, in which the authority of the church was vindicated in a

manner worthy of Roman jurisprudence; but what could the church do? There remained no alternative but either to condemn itself or the pastor who had presumed to doubt its authority. Of course it condemned the pastor; but did not finally depose him, until he had taken some further steps to justify his opinions. During these proceedings, M. Merle d'Aubigné, a minister of the Genevan church, but who had been several years established at Bruxelles, returned to his native country. With an extensive knowledge of ecclesiastical history, particularly of the period of the Reformation, and well acquainted with the state of religion in Germany, where he had witnessed the fatal effects of neologism, he came home well prepared to combat the errors of Unitarianism. Another minister of eminent piety, M. Galland, who depended for his worldly prospects upon the national church, was equally desirous with the other two to repair the venerable fabric which the philosophy of calamitous times had well nigh thrown down to the ground. There were in the ecclesiastical body at least four others, who equally deplored the degeneracy of the faith; but they did not think it expedient to adopt the same decisive measures that appeared necessary to M. Gaussen and his colleagues. Partaking of that timidity and indecision which belongs to the Genevan character, but which often springs, we believe, from the amiable motive of preserving peace in the social and domestic circles, the small Trinitarian party stood in respectful silence behind the marshalled forces of the Arians; and the Arian majority on the other hand were careful, by a suppression of their negative faith, not to call forth the positive confession of the other. Thus did the three zealous ministers, who were now to act as defenders of the ancient faith, lose the co-operation of their brethren, who remained, with one or two additions to their numbers, and yet do remain, as a portion of the National Church. Our readers will therefore now understand that out of the Venerable Company of pastors as at present constituted, being about twenty-eight in number, five or six are known to adhere to all the essential doctrines contained in the Helvetic Confession. We may safely enumerate three or four more who are disposed to hold the faith, if not in full unity of the spirit, at least in the bonds of peace, and in righteousness of life. Refusing equally to be called Trinitarians or Unitarians, they are delighted to preach the doctrine of the Atonement, and not unwilling to admit the awful consequences of the fall of man. If to these the five deposed ministers could now be added, it would be hard to pronounce upon the pre-eminence. The Venerable Company, therefore, have really secured their existence as a body by *exclusion*; and in this we cannot blame them; but they afford us a timely warning not

to place our venerated institutions upon the same "liberal" footing. It will be perceived that we are now left with a score of pastors on our hands, with as many different modes of faith, but without any adequate means of ascertaining them. But they may be placed in a scale of heterodoxy, beginning with semi-Arianism, and ending with Socinianism. The twenty pastors are unanimous in their rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity; some of them admit the doctrine of Atonement in a "modified" sense, and in general they are great admirers of the writings of the American Unitarian Dr. Channing. The doctrines of grace, influence of the Holy Spirit, the divinity of Christ, original sin, and such like, they consider as things indifferent, and as tending to perplex simple minds. We do not intend or pretend to fasten this description of creed or unbelief upon any one, two, or three; but the twenty will, upon the whole, find their account in it. The Venerable Company, however, have frequently complained, that they are misrepresented and their faith calumniated; and through the medium of their periodical publication, *Le Protestant de Genève*, it has recently been denied that there is such a thing as Socinianism amongst them. In order that we may not incur the charge of misrepresentation, we shall let them speak for themselves; and, first, the professor of divinity. "I cannot repeat it too often nor too plainly that these obscure doctrines (scilicet, the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ) are of no kind of consequence to our salvation."—*Du Système Theol. de la Trinité, par M. Chenevière, Pasteur et Professeur à Genève*, p. 233. Again, "In this respect I differ from the Arians as well as from the Trinitarians, and I by no means admit that Jesus was the Creator of the world, or the instrument that the Father made use of for creating the material world. I understand these words (John, i. 3) as relating to the new Evangelical dispensation, and as having nothing to do with the creation of the world."—*Du Syst. &c.* p. 155. "When it is attentively remarked that there is not in the Scriptures any command to pay religious worship to Christ, it is surprising that a large number of Christians should think that necessary."—*Ibid.* p. 168. "It is never taught (in the Scriptures) that the object, or any one of the objects of Christ's coming into the world, was to deliver the world from an inherited sin, and from the evil that it had introduced."—*Du Pêché Originel, par M. Chenevière, Pasteur et Professeur à Genève*, p. 318. "I reject all those ideas of the anger of God, of the necessity of blood shed, of the curse transferred to Jesus on account of Adam's transgression, and of actual transgressions."—*De notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, de ses bienfaits, et en particulier par la Rédemption, par M. Chenevière, Pasteur, &c.* p. 288. But we had better see the result of

all the Professor's learning, thought, and religion at once. "I leave then entirely and for ever these ideas of an offended God, whose anger must be appeased, and whose glory must be vindicated; these are figurative expressions, which signify only that God is holy, and that he punishes those who violate his laws. I leave these ideas of an infinite debt of sinners which required an infinite price. I reject all that has been said about Jesus suffering in his body the chastisement due to the guilty; the doctrine of a satisfaction (for sin) is purely human, unknown in the primitive Church, and a doctrine of which the Scriptures say not one word, and that common sense abhors."—*De notre Seigneur Jesus Christ*, &c. p. 342. *Ibid.* p. 284. Our readers may now be disposed "to leave for ever and entirely" the Professor of Divinity at Geneva; and we doubt not that many of them, recollecting what the professors in that academy once were, will be ready to exclaim in reading these lamentable extracts, "How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!" For our parts we do not think that we shall malign the faith of the professor, if we designate him the boldest and most reckless Socinian that ever appeared in public. But as long as the Venerable Company declare that no single individual among them is allowed to be the organ of their sentiments in matters of belief or doctrine, not even the man whom they place in the theological chair, we can never bring their doctrines to light until every one of them follows the example of their professor. It does, however, happen that we can bring the same sentiments home to some others of the most influential of their body. About three years ago a monthly journal was established at Geneva called "*Le Protestant*," and in one of the early numbers the names of those pastors who contributed the articles were published amongst them: we have Mons. Bassett, jun. now *President* of the Company of Pastors; Mons. Choisy, jun. *Secretary* of the said Company; Mons. Munier, *Professor* in Theology, on whom devolves the task of lecturing on the Scriptures to the students in the academy. Besides these gentlemen now occupying the highest ecclesiastical offices, several other names were given, of which Mons. Bouvier's may be considered the most influential. As this journal has declared without contradiction that it speaks the general sense of the venerable body, with the exception of the Trinitarians of course, we shall certainly consider the following extracts from its pages to be decisive as to the state of Theology in the National Church of Geneva. "This Divine Master (John, x. 33) positively forbids himself to be made a God by the Jews, and proclaims himself only to be the Son of God; but not without remarking that the ancient law, nevertheless, called gods those men to whom the word was addressed."—

Protestant de Genève, vol. ii. p. 208. "Is the Methodist more convinced of his salvation, because he *materializes* redemption, as one may say, and represents to himself our sins as a burden that God takes off us, and throws upon Christ, or as a debt that we must pay, but which the Saviour pays for us."—*Protestant de Genève*, vol. ii. p. 130. "What good does it do us to know that Adam had any thing to do in our sins."—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 131.*

We think it right to subjoin the extracts from the writings of the Genevan divines, in their original language, in the order in which they have just been cited.

"Je ne saurais répéter trop souvent et à trop haute voix, que ces doctrines obscures (viz. the Trinity and Divinity of Christ) ne font rien pour le salut."—*Du Syst. Theol. de la Trinité*, par M. Chenevière, Pasteur et Professeur à Genève, p. 233.

"J'entends ces paroles (Jean, i. 3.) comme relatives à la nouvelle dispensation évangélique et nullement à la création du monde."—*Du Syst. &c.* p. 155.

"Lorsqu'on fait attention qu'il n'y a dans l'écriture-sainte aucun ordre d'offrir au Christ un culte religieux, il est surprenant que bon nombre de Chrétiens le jugent nécessaire."—*Ibid.* p. 168.

"Jamais il n'est enseigné que le but ou que l'un des buts de la venue de Christ ait été de délivrer le monde d'un péché héréditaire et des malheurs qu'il avait entraînés."—*Du Pêché Originel*, par M. Chenevière, p. 318.

"Je repousse toutes ces idées de courroux de Dieu, de la nécessité du sang versé, de la malédiction transportée sur Jesus à cause du péché d'Adam et des péchés actuels."—*De notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, de ses bienfaits*, &c. par Chenevière, p. 288.

"Je laisse donc à tout jamais ces idées de Dieu offensé, dont il faut apaiser la colère et venger la gloire; ce sont des expressions figurées, qui signifient que Dieu est saint et qu'il punit ceux qui violent ses lois. Je laisse ces idées d'une dette infinie des pecheurs pour laquelle il fallait un prix infini. Je repousse tout ce qui a été dit de Jesus souffrant dans son corps les châtimens dus aux coupables . . . il n'y a pas eu de châtimement infligé à celui que n'avait commis aucune faute, et d'ailleurs ceux que la Bible appelle justes et droits de cœur, n'avaient pas mérité le supplice de la croix."—*De notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, de ses bienfaits*, &c. p. 342.

"La satisfaction est un dogme purement humain, ignoré de la primitive église, un dogme dont l'écriture ne dit pas un mot, et que le bon sens repousse."—*Ibid.* p. 284.

"Ce Divin Maître (Jean, x. 33, 36) se défend positivement auprès des Juifs de s'être fait Dieu, et se proclame seulement fils de Dieu, non sans avoir remarqué que l'ancienne loi appelait cependant dieux des

* In designating the believer in the expiatory sacrifice of Christ a Methodist, the President, Secretary, Professor and Colleagues show either ignorance or perversion, or both.

hommes à qui la parole est adressée.”—*Protestant de Genève*, vol. ii. p. 208.

“Le Methodiste est-il plus convaincu de son salut parce qu’il matérialise, pour ainsi dire, la redemption, et se représente nos péchés comme un fardeau que Dieu nous ôte et jette sur le Christ, ou comme une dette que nous devons payer et que le Sauveur paie pour nous.”—*Protestant de Genève*, vol. ii. p. 120.

“A quoi nous sert de savoir qu’Adam est pour quelque chose dans nos péchés.”—*Protestant de Genève*, vol. ii. p. 131.

The same journal has published a translation of the Creed of the German Doctor Rahr—and this is his doctrine relative to the person of Christ. “Art. 11. According to a particular scheme of God, Jesus Christ appeared as a man amongst men, and led the life of a man, distinguished by particular actions and events. Art. 12. Because of the intellectual and moral perfection that Jesus Christ re-united to his human nature, he was in the closest union with God. Art. 13. In accomplishing the mission with which God had charged him, Jesus Christ obtained a lawful right to the most exalted dignity among intelligent creatures, and to the title of only Son of God, &c.”—*Protestant de Genève*, vol. iv. p. 159. We shall only add to these irrefragable proofs of Arianism, at least of Geneva, that several numbers of the journal in question are almost entirely taken up with translations of the works of Dr. Channing.

Under whatever pretext or subtlety the national church of Geneva may now attempt to shield itself, however individual members of it may claim exemption from the charge or modification of the title; we shall continue to call it, as we shall hold it up to the Christian world, an Arian-Socinian Church, a church fallen from the faith of its venerable founders; and, therefore, we shall hail, as we are now about to do, every effort which is made among the citizens of Geneva to revive the doctrines of the Helvetic Creed, and leave a more sound and holy system of instruction to succeeding generations.

Mons. Gaussen, and his coadjutors, knowing the state of their national religious institutions to be such as we have described, resolved, by the blessing of God, to remedy at least a portion of the evil. They had already, in conjunction with some of the most influential and wealthy citizens, formed a society for the purposes of mutual edification and diffusion of the Scriptures and religious books. This had been considered by the venerable body as an act of rebellion against their authority; but there were no laws either civil or ecclesiastical by which to bring the offenders to judgment. The three zealous ministers, seeing further the hopeless condition of the rising generation, the kind of instruction the young men were doomed to receive at the academy, likewise resolved to esta-

blish a theological school to be conducted on their own principles. They began by presenting a memorial to the Executive Government, which they called a "Communication respectueuse." In this was set forth the necessity, as it appeared to them, of some religious instruction of a more scriptural and evangelical nature than was to be found in the academy, and they announced their intention of establishing their new school as soon as they could procure resources. For this the three ministers were called to the bar of the Venerable Company, tried, condemned, and finally expelled the national church; the sentences were confirmed by the "Obsequious Senate," whom the company of Pastors had again brought to the necessity of deposing either the three ministers or the national Church.*

We shall now, like the Professor of Divinity, "leave entirely and for ever" that "liberal system" of admitting all persons of whatever opinion into a national church or religious institution. We shall reject "all those ideas" of toleration, full liberty of expressing opinions, &c. &c. which in the course of twelve years exclude one sixth of a constituted body; and without presuming to touch the modern Theology of Geneva, we shall cleave to our "exclusive doctrines" as contained in the Articles, Creeds and Formularies of our Church,† and it thus only remains to give

* Our readers should be acquainted with the mode of proceeding in the deposition of a minister or pastor of the Genevan Church, observing that a minister is one who has never been nominated to any pastoral charge; but when so nominated, they are called pastors, and ever after retain that title, as well as the privilege of a vote in the general assembly. The Synod, or general assembly of pastors, first pronounces judgment by a majority of votes; their decision is then taken before the Consistory to be confirmed or annulled; if confirmed, it then rests with the Council of State, or Executive Government, to pronounce the final judgment: this power is vested in the state, because the salaries or stipends are paid by the state; and it will easily be perceived how difficult it is for the Executive Government to refuse to confirm the judgment of the two ecclesiastical courts. This same method is adopted in all the Protestant Churches of France, where the ministers are paid by the state, and the final decision in a case of deposing a pastor rests with the Minister of Public Instruction: the French minister was not long ago brought into a similar predicament by the Synod at Lyons, in the case of Mons. Adolphe Monod. Messrs. Gaussens, Merle, and Galland, had, however, in their case to complain of the irregularity of the proceedings. First, they were not furnished with a copy of their accusation, so that they knew not upon what ground to take up their defence; secondly, they contended, that there existed no canon, or law, to condemn them for any thing they had done, as it regarded discipline; and thirdly, they complained of the state of the Consistory.—For the Consistory, according to the ecclesiastical polity of the Presbyterian, should be composed of clergy and laymen, the latter being at least equal in number to the former; but at Geneva the clergy have occupied, with two or three exceptions, all the seats in the Consistory, so that the "Venerable Company" condemns in one room, and then passes into another to ratify their verdict. This places the Council of State, at once, exactly in the dilemma we have stated, either to depose the condemned minister or the national church. The conduct of the Venerable Company was, of course, justified in several pamphlets by an appeal to ecclesiastical laws and canons; but all these were written after the three ministers were safely deposed.

† We have frequently observed, in the monthly journal of the pastors, allusions to

our readers a short account of the progress of the new theological school, and the "*Société Évangélique*," the light which has sprung up in a dark place.

The "*Société*," which is now of about four years standing, was originally confined to about half-a-dozen persons. The Theological School was begun by Mons. Gaussen and his two colleagues. These two institutions are now embodied in one; for they are both directed by the same committee, and the professors in the school are the preachers in the *Société*. The object of the two-fold institution will be most concisely set forth to our readers in the three first articles of its regulations:—

"Art. 1. *La Société Évangélique de Genève* a pour but de travailler à l'avancement du règne de Dieu.

"Art. 2. Elle tend à ce but par les moyens qui lui paraissent les plus propres à l'atteindre, et principalement par l'enseignement théologique, l'exposition publique de la parole de Dieu, et le dissémination des *Saintes-Ecritures*.

"Art. 3. Les exemplaires des livres saints employés par la *Société* seront sans notes ni commentaires, &c."

As soon as the formation of these institutions was made known in England, Holland, Germany, and America, a lively interest was created among various denominations of Christians in all those countries; and donations were transmitted to the committee of the *Société* to a considerable amount; but the cause of true religion at Geneva was not entirely dependent upon foreign aid; many wealthy and influential citizens flocked to the standard which had been raised in favour of the doctrines of the Reformation: the names of Henri Tronchin, Charles Gautier, L. G. Cramer, and others in civil authority, were found in the committee, and the "house of prayer" in the Rue des Chanoines was soon found too small to admit all who had enlisted under the banner of Orthodoxy. The sum total of the receipts for the years 1832 and 1833 did not fall short of 2000*l*. The committee was therefore not only enabled to extend the field of the society's labours in the department of Missions in France, but also to furnish the school with five Professors in the various branches of Theology and Biblical learning. Mons. Merle D'Aubigné, who presides over the school, is the author of the treatise whose title appears at the head of this article, and the editor of a religious

our creeds and articles; and we are sometimes taunted with our popish liturgy—our articles, as Dr. Paley said, are merely "*Articles of Peace*," and our Athanasian Creed only worthy of the tenth century. Le Protestant de Genève has shown such a knowledge of "*Methodism*," when he asks, if "*the Methodist feels more satisfied when he represents Christ as paying his debt*," that we must tremble, indeed, if ever he comes to touch our articles.

journal called the "*Gazette Evangelique*." The Theological School can now reckon upwards of twenty students, and, through the liberality of their American brethren especially, the directors have been enabled to found six exhibitions of 600 francs each, to be adjudged to the best scholars. But the success of the orthodox institution has not stopped here. Through the munificence of M. Tronchin, whose devotedness to the cause of truth we cannot too much admire, and through the generous efforts of some other distinguished citizens, the society has been enabled to build a new church, with all the necessary appendages of a school, committee-rooms, &c.; so that, although the national church exhibits the melancholy picture which we have thought it our duty to draw of it, the *City of Geneva* must not be viewed by our readers in the same light; and as we are told that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, we are not without great hopes that the efforts which are making without the pale of that fallen church, and the signs of life which are yet within it in the persons of the few orthodox pastors, will finally restore one of the most venerated Reformed Churches to its proper place in the Christian world. But it is not the least remarkable thing in the history of the revival of the true faith, that the promoters of it should all as it were have been raised up by the thunders of excommunication proceeding from an Unitarian synod. The unconscious pastors may be said to have built Mons. Malan his chapel, which now has its congregation, and to have procured for him the powerful aid of foreign societies in disseminating his tracts and religious publications. By the expulsion of the minister Bost,* they may be said to have raised up the *Société du Bourg du Four*, and planted a chapel, with something of the virulence of dissent, at the very doors of their assembly. With these adversaries, limited in their means, and often falling into extremes, they might have contended; but the *Société Evangelique* has assumed a too formidable aspect: it has connected itself with most of the Reformed Churches in Europe, and even with America; and in the list of its members (correspondents), as given in the report of the "*Troisième Anniversaire*," we observe three clergymen of the Church of England, two of the Church of Scotland, and three Americans. But it will doubtless be more interesting to our readers to know the interest which Ministers of our Church

* After the expulsion of Mons. Gaussen and his colleagues, a pious young man, avowedly coinciding with the deposed ministers in all their religious views, was nominated by the Venerable Company to one of the principal churches of the city; this was to recompense the orthodox citizens who had not joined the "*Société Evangelique*," and to maintain the principle of "*nulla doctrina*." By pointing to this act the pastors saved much argument, but Mons. Bard, the new "*Evangelical*," has always his church filled; and, we think, is preparing more work for the pastors. The *Société Evangelique* very properly rejoined, "every way Christ is preached."

have shown in these efforts to maintain the essential points of her doctrines. The following letter was read at the third anniversary, to which were appended the *names of four hundred and fifty of our clergy*, all genuine autographs except the last twenty-two:—

“ Epistle to the Evangelical Society of Geneva.

“ Beloved brethren,

“ We the undersigned Ministers of the Church of England, having heard, that, stedfast in your adherence to the Gospel, you faithfully maintain its fundamental doctrines—the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, the Atonement he made for sin, Justification by Faith alone, and Regeneration by the Holy Spirit—we cannot refrain from sending you the expression of our affection and esteem. We heartily pray for you, that, in all your endeavours to spread the knowledge of Christ, you may be enabled, through all difficulties, to evince his gentleness and meekness with his unconquerable zeal and boldness in the cause of God. We entreat him to sustain you under your trials by the consolation of his Spirit, and we beg to assure you, that looking upon these doctrines for which you contend as the very substance of the Gospel, we and many others in our country are labouring together with you to make them known,—we earnestly desire to see your Christian efforts so blessed of the Lord, that they may be productive of extended and lasting good to all those churches of the continent in which the French language is spoken. Commending you to the grace and blessing of God, we remain your faithful and affectionate brethren.”

Mons. Tronchin, the president of the meeting, after reading this epistle, added:—

“ Your Committee has deeply felt the value of this testimony of approbation and esteem from a Church in which so much light shines, and which has had the glory of commencing most of those societies formed for the purpose of diffusing the Gospel, and sending men to preach it to the distant nations. May the ties which for so many years have existed between the Christianity of England and Switzerland become daily more sacred.”—*Assemblée Générale*, p. 13.

It is impossible for us to remain indifferent spectators of such scenes as Geneva has exhibited within the last four years to the religious world. Whilst they afford us warning, and attach us the more to our Apostolical Institutions, they also excite our zeal and promote our brotherly love towards those godly men who are found on the continent of Europe, to “ contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints;” they afford us warning to keep the doors of our Sanctuary closed against all profanation of “ Philosophy, falsely so called,” and not to be seduced by specious terms, such as “ liberality” and “ toleration.” We have before us an example of what an Unitarian synod understands by these terms; and we think it a blessing that our institutions, and especially our universities, are so framed as rather to refuse admittance at once to dissent, than after having admitted all men without distinction of

creeds, to be under the necessity of excluding them for the very preservation of their existence.

We understand the Venerable Company of pastors have resolved to commemorate the era of the Reformation in their city. It was in 1535 that the Council of State declared the religion of Rome to be no longer that of the Republic, and acknowledged the doctrines of the Reformation. The Venerable Company, anxious to give more honour, if possible, than they have lately done, to the inauguration of the statue of Jean Jacques Rousseau, have written letters to many of the reformed churches, entreating them to send representatives to testify the good will and fellowship which may be borne towards the Church of Calvin. We believe they have for this purpose addressed his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and also the heads of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland.* The orthodox portion of the Genevan community have frequently, and truly, asserted that the National Church was no longer held in fellowship with the Churches of England and Scotland; and further, that every orthodox church in Christendom must necessarily withdraw its approbation from a body professing "Unitarian tenets," contrary to the faith which their forefathers preached; and, we confess, we are at a loss to conceive in what manner the Venerable Company proposes to commemorate the establishment of a religion from the great principles of which that body has so widely departed. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury will doubtless consult the answers which his great predecessor, Dr. Wake, gave to the pastors of Geneva, when they wrote to him concerning some abstruse points of Metaphysical Theology. He exhorted them to forbearance and toleration, and he recommended the Church of England to them as a model. This correspondence, which took place in 1718 and 1719, will be found in the Appendixes to Mosheim, vol. iv. Append. iii. Nos. xx. xxii. xxiv. We should be inclined to give no other answers to the moderator's letter than a few words selected from Archbishop Wake's instructions:—"Subscriptant ministri, *professores, theologi* confessioni vestræ veteri, anno [—] editæ: prohibeantur, sub quâvislibet pœnâ, ne ullam in concionibus, scriptis, thesibus, prælectionibus, sententiam publicè tueantur illi confessioni quovis modo contrariam:" but what would the Archbishop have said now, if he could have been told that the very Confession of Faith, to which he refers them as their standard, had been formally abolished!

* The Kirk Assembly, we understand, has already given its answer to the Moderator's Letter,—a painful one to contemplate, but such as under existing circumstances we must highly approve of.

- ART. V.—1. *Speech of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., in the House of Commons, on Thursday, the 2nd of April, 1835.* Murray, London.
2. *The Roman Catholic Oath considered.* By Eneas Mac Donnell, Esq. &c. &c. 1835. Churton, London.
3. *Further Considerations of the Roman Catholic Oath, in a Letter to Edward Blount, Esq. late Secretary to the English Roman Catholic Association.* By Eneas Mac Donnell, Esq. &c. &c. 1835. Churton, London.

WE very much wish that our readers would do their best to imagine themselves in the following situation; namely,—that they are beholding a vessel boarded by pirates,—that they are able to watch the progress of the mortal strife,—that they are close enough to see the crew, after a gallant resistance, on the point of being driven beneath the hatches,—and that nothing is before them, but the ultimate prospect of the good ship being first plundered, and, then, skuttled, and sent to the bottom. Let them conceive this; and then let them further suppose that some indignant friend of law and justice were at their elbow, clamorously demanding that they, or some one among them, should draw up deliberately, and on the spot, a sober and well-reasoned statement of the atrocities of the case, with a view to bringing the offenders to justice; or, at all events, for the purpose of submitting the matter, for redress, to the judgment of a discerning, intelligent, and righteous *Public!* Let our readers only endeavour to imagine this;—and then they will have some faint notion of the feelings with which we set ourselves down to the composition of a paper on the wrongs of the Irish Church; or, rather, of the Irish branch of the Anglican Church.

Is the above an exaggerated and fantastic adumbration of the actual case, which, at this moment, fixes the faculty of eye, and ear, and thought, throughout the empire? Is it an exhibition, after the ghastly fashion of a phantasmagoria, got up for the purpose of frightening His Majesty's Protestant subjects from their sobriety? Can any figurative representation,—which the “fine frenzy,” or the morbid calenture, of a feverish brain, may conjure up,—do justice to the prosaic, but most disastrous, reality, now before the eyes of every professor of the Reformed Faith, in this distracted kingdom?

But let us toss all tropes and metaphors to the winds. Let us come, at once, to a calm, sedate, matter-of-fact consideration, of the portentous phenomena which are now besetting us, “above, about, and underneath.” Calmness and sedateness are, under

critical circumstances, most admirable qualities. They always become a wise man. And, of course, they are eminently becoming in a Christian man. *Calmly*, therefore, is the word. And we will faithfully labour to recollect that word; albeit flesh, and blood, and heart, may, at some moments, fret and rebel against it.

Well then,—it is known to every human being in England, Scotland, and Ireland—to every one, at least, who reads a newspaper, or hears a newspaper read—from the triflers of the saloon, to the *benchers* of the murkiest and most rank-scented tap-house,—that a certain resolution has, recently, appeared upon the Journals of the Commons' House of Parliament. It is almost superfluous to transcribe it. Protestant and Papist—Conservative, Whig, and Radical—all, by this time, must doubtless have it by heart. Nevertheless, to prevent the possibility of mistake, here it is:

“That this House do resolve itself into a Committee, in order to consider the present state of the Church Establishment in Ireland; with a view of applying any *surplus* of its revenues, *not required for the spiritual care of its members*, to the *general* education of all classes of the people, *without distinction of religious persuasion*.”—April 2, 1835.

This, it is equally well known, was speedily followed up by another resolution, very like unto the former, only still more noble and magnanimous; to wit—that,

“No measure, on the subject of Tithes in Ireland, can lead to a satisfactory and *final* adjustment, which does not embody the principle contained in the foregoing resolution.”

Now, unquestionably, it becomes not us to plunge into the troubled waters of political strife. It does not befit our office to bring railing accusations against this or that party,—or to dig and delve our way downward, till we reach the depths in which the motives of public men may have their hiding place. To every man who, in simplicity of heart, is seeking the good of his country, we heartily cry—God speed thee! To every man whose feet may be swift, either to seize the spoil, or to shed blood, we are content to say—the Lord rebuke thee! Refuges of lies there may be, in abundance, throughout the region of politics, suited to consciences of every imaginable form and dimension. But we explore them not. Our business is to deal with things as we find them; not to waste our spirits, and perhaps endanger our charity, by an eager investigation of the process, and the agency, by which such things have been brought to pass. Nevertheless, it may be not unprofitable—(while it falls strictly and legitimately within our province)—to remind our readers, *historically*, of one or two circumstances, which led to the two *placita*, or *plebis-scita*, above

recited,—although they seemed, at the time, to lead in a direction exactly opposite.

Be it, then, remembered, that in 1833, the words *surplus*, and *appropriation*, began to be familiar to the lips and thoughts of many of the most *active* members of the legislature; and a vehement effort was, accordingly, made by them, to *embody* those principles, and to incorporate them in certain measures, then in agitation, with reference to the Irish Church. In this attempt they met with decided opposition from His Majesty's Ministers; and from no one among them with *more* decided opposition, than from a leading member of the administration, known, throughout the land, as the man-midwife of the Reform Bill. I affirm,—said Lord John Russell,—that, if ministers were to yield to the cry for *appropriation*, it would be to “assert a *general principle without any adequate necessity*.—‘The present’—his lordship added—“was but the *shadow of a claim*; to prosecute which, would be to *risk the peace and tranquillity of the country, for the sake of an abstract principle*.” In 1834, again, the same individual positively refused to pledge himself to an *abstract principle*, the applicability of which might be contradicted by inquiry subsequent to the pledge. “The better course,”—he said—“would be to appoint a *commission* of laymen, to ascertain *facts*; and then to introduce a measure founded on facts.”

It must have struck every one that, of late, *Commissions* have been a very favourite remedy for all the diseases of the body politic. The patient is ill; what is to be done?—*Commissionare!* The patient is getting worse; the prescription is still—*Commissionare!* The patient is at the point of death;—the answer is reiterated,—*ensuita Commissionare!* The remedy is somewhat expensive, to be sure. But what of that? What are patients good for, but to pay fees? On this occasion, accordingly, a Commission was issued, to *ascertain facts*. It commenced its operations without delay; and, up to the moment at which we are writing,—May, 30th—the commission has been—dumb!

We now come to 1835. And here, to our utter astonishment, we find the *Abstract Principles* suddenly *embodied* with a vengeance! The shadow—the phantom—the airy nothing—has, suddenly, become a substantial, tangible, and potent thing! Like the spectre-statue in *Don Juan*, it has started into activity and motion. And this prodigy has been effected, we presume, by the magic touch of some *adequate necessity*, which had no existence in the two preceding years. What that *adequate necessity* might be,—unless it were the *necessity* of expelling a conservative administration,—it far transcends our sagacity to divine. The *Commission* is still silent. No new facts have been ascertained. The *surplus* is

still as apparitional as ever. And yet, somehow or other, the dire *necessity*, whatever it may be, has at length burst forth. It has uttered its voice, and done its work: and we all know the result. Under its influence, the *Abstract Principle* has stretched out an arm massive and ponderous as marble; and powerful enough to hurl Sir Robert Peel, and his illustrious colleague, from their seats!

So much for the mere history of the matter. It now remains for us to consider what further exploits are to be expected from the *Abstract Principle*. This principle is now *embodied* in the above two *ordinances*—(for what are they else?)—of the Commons of England,—(no; not of the Commons of *England*; for a majority of the Commons of *England* was against them)—rather, in two *ordinances* of the Irish Repealers, and the Scottish gentlemen of the movement. We dismiss, however, all further thoughts, as to how they found their way to the journals of the House. We ask not whether the *intents* of *all* who combined to place them there, were wicked or charitable. We propose to examine them, without reference to any supposed services which they may have rendered to a party. Here they are—no matter how—before our eyes. We shall, accordingly, endeavour to look at them, just as if we had accidentally picked them up in a gutter: and confine our thoughts, as much as possible, to the consequences with which they threaten the stability of the Protestant Church, and the integrity of the British Empire.

It is, then, the recorded opinion of the *Imperial House* of Commons, first, that any surplus revenues of the Irish Church, may be legitimately applied to the purposes of *general* education; and, secondly, that any project for the adjustment of Irish tithes must be hopeless, unless it shall recognize and embody this very principle. The thoughts which rush into the mind on witnessing these peremptory edicts, are multitudinous and overpowering! To our ears, they are as a trumpet-note which *renders no uncertain sound*! They seem to us to proclaim little less than a war of extermination against the Protestant faith, in Ireland at least, if not throughout the Empire. We believe, at any rate, that such is their all but inevitable tendency. We believe, too, that nine out of ten of all individuals in the kingdom, who have the faculty of serious thought, are, on this point, at the same persuasion with ourselves. And every one must be quite sure that the Whig-compelling Jove, who now rules the destinies of Ireland, is graciously pleased to regard this *avatar* of the *Abstract Principle* as an agency worthy to be employed by his Omnipotence, in working out his glorious designs for the regeneration of Ireland.

And yet there are people,—tolerably sober-minded people, too,

—(we ourselves have met with such)—who seem lost in astonishment, when they hear these oracles of legislative wisdom spoken of as signals for *spoliation*. And the reason of this is pretty obvious. Spoliation is a very vile and awkward phrase. No person, who has any regard for his own good name, likes to have it hanging on his tongue, or sounding in his ears. But, *appropriation*!—who can object to a wise and liberal *appropriation* of superfluous wealth, which is actually crying out for some fit use to which it may be applied? From *spoliation*,—say these men of wise and moderate counsels—from *spoliation* may Heaven defend us all! We only seek to *appropriate*, what the Church can well do without, to purposes which the Church, if it deserves the name, must desire to see accomplished, as cordially and impatiently as ourselves. In the name of candour, and equity, and Christian charity, let it not, for one moment, be imagined, that plunder or sacrilege is in our thoughts! We are as anxious as men can be, for the prosperity, the honour, the efficiency of the Protestant Church in Ireland. But we apprehend, that her condition, at this moment, will be found to be somewhat unwieldy and plethoric. And we desire nothing, under Heaven, but her relief from this deadly oppression. And, if the blood she loses can be vitally transfused into other veins, who can deny that the operation is merciful and beneficent?—merciful to herself, beneficent to all who are to derive life and vigour from the overflowings of her exuberant health. Spoliation and pillage, therefore, are terms which ought not to escape the lips of Christian men, when they are speaking of this great master-stroke of wise and religious policy: for they are “words, which no Christian ear can endure to hear.” *Errare possum*—it has been said—*hereticus esse nolo*: that is, (in plain Irish), an *appropriator* I may be; but Heaven forbid that I should be a *plunderer*!

We are not greatly disposed to quarrel with the distinction of our *apologists*. It must be confessed that it is a distinction quite as much entitled to respect as the qualms of another celebrated professor of the noble science of *appropriation*. “Steal!—foh! a fico for phrase. *Concey* the wise it call.” The *apologists*, however, are doubtless aware that *appropriation* will be found, after all, to be “a word of exceeding good command.” It can speak in the imperative mood, not quite so rudely and noisily, perhaps, but quite as intelligibly, as many other phrases which sound less “graceful and humane.” Between *appropriation* and robbery, in short, there is about the same sort of difference, that there is between the application of a courtly highwayman, with the bearing of a lord, who *requests* your purse with the most perfect good breeding imaginable,—and the demand of the foot-

pad, who roars out, *stand and deliver!* with bludgeon or cutlass in his hand. For instance—the Commons' House of Parliament, of course, can never be guilty of robbery. The very thought of such a thing calls up the awful vision of the Serjeant at Arms before our eyes. But then, the Commons' House of Parliament *may* resolve upon appropriation; and the House of Peers may dutifully register their edict; and the whole may be completed with the becoming solemnity of the royal sanction. And when the thing is conducted in this very considerate and decorous manner, what loyal subject is there who will not feel almost flattered and delighted with so orderly and legitimate a process, for the deduction of a moderate portion from his *peculium*? Under the influence of these reflections, we really are sensible of some "compunctious visitings," for having ventured on the ugly phrases of—pillage and spoliation: and we approach, with feelings of due respect and awe, the consideration of the two solemn *ordinances* above adverted to. In so doing, however, we trust that we shall be forgiven, if we presume to submit what would be our own view of the matter, if we happened, ourselves, to be Members of the Honourable House, and were called upon to deliberate and to vote upon resolutions, similar to those in question. And this we shall do with the greater confidence, because we have now before us the deliberate opinion of a distinguished Roman Catholic;—of one who cannot, certainly, be charged with any defect of zeal for the advancement of his own Church, or for the rights and privileges of her faithful sons. The person to whom we allude, is Eneas Macdonnell, Esq., "Barrister at Law, Agent to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, from November, 1824, till the passing of the Act for relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects, in April, 1829." The Pamphlet of this gentleman is on our table. We earnestly implore the attention of our readers to the whole of that astounding publication. But we now, more particularly, submit to their consideration, one or two of its concluding paragraphs. The object of it is to show that the oath administered to Roman Catholic members of the legislature, ought to stand in the way, for an adversary against them, whenever they are about to give their vote in favour of any proposition directly, or indirectly, injurious to the Protestant Church.

"The Catholic Oath did not originate with Protestants; it was not Protestant, either in its conception, its birth, or its growth. It is substantially, literally, purely, *emphatically*, a Catholic Oath; suggested by Catholics, desired by Catholics, conceded to Catholics, framed in the spirit, and almost in the terms, proposed by Catholics, and taken by Catholics. The Declaration of 1757 embodied that spirit and suggested the Oath, as we have already seen, nearly forty years before the Oath

was enacted by the Protestant Parliament of Ireland in 1793. The petition of 1792 also aided in the suggestion. And as to the Oath of 1829, it was preceded not only by that Declaration of 1757, but by every one of those pledges, declarations, petitions, and other publications voluntarily emanating from the Catholics of both countries to which I have referred; and, I am well convinced, I could truly add, by hundreds, nay, thousands of others, of similar import. The fact being, that the Protestant connexion of that Oath of 1829, 'hath this extent, no more,' that a Protestant Parliament reduced to the form of an Oath, the professions, pledges, dispositions, and declarations of the Catholics.

"I conclude, therefore, with the repetition of my early declaration, that if I were a Member of either House of Parliament, I *should not feel myself at liberty to vote or speak in support of any measure having for its object the severance of any portion of the Church Property from the Establishment, for any purposes whatever*; and I should, of course, feel equally bound to decline being, directly or indirectly, connected with any resolution or other proposition involving, expressly or by implication, a recognition of the principle of such severance. Indeed, the more vague and indistinct such resolution or proposition might be, the more direct and resolute should be my abstinence from any participation in its support. I do not presume to direct the conduct of others, but I desire to possess myself, as I now do, of the means to prove, if necessary, at any future period, for the vindication of my own consistency and good faith, or the fame of my country, that he who had been, for some years, the Agent of the Catholics of Ireland, if he did not control what he conscientiously considered to be the erroneous course of others, had, at least, raised his warning voice against a course, which, in his opinion, tends, directly and expressly, to justify, not the confidence and promises of friends, but the distrust and predictions of enemies: a fact, inglorious and galling though it be, which a perusal of the debates in the House of Commons, even for the single month of March, 1829, would most painfully, but not less unquestionably, establish."—p. 39—41.

We have here, then, a Roman Catholic—the chosen agent of the "Catholic Association,"—the man who was principally active in the framing and the circulation of between seven and eight hundred thousand tracts, pamphlets, declarations, and *pledges*, on behalf of his *Catholic* brethren and constituents;—we find this man declaring that, if he were in parliament, he should feel himself bound to neutrality and silence, with respect to any measure for the *severance of any portion of the church property from the establishment, for ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER*! And here we may very fitly introduce another very striking declaration, in the same spirit, and much to the same effect. We allude to a very remarkable letter recently addressed by a Roman Catholic gentleman of property (Mr. Waterton) to the editor of a public journal,* in which the writer proclaims—not merely what he should

* The St. James's Chronicle.

feel himself bound to do, or to abstain from, *if* he were in parliament—but that, so long as the oath shall be tendered, it must be impossible for him ever to be in parliament! “Catholic emancipation,” says Mr. Waterton, “has done nothing worth speaking of for me. I can neither be a member of parliament or magistrate. For no entreaty, no power on earth, shall ever make me take Peel’s oath. *If I understand the English language* (and I ought to understand it, for I was with the Jesuits till I was twenty years old), *that oath binds me before Almighty God to abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment.*” And then he goes on to say, plainly and openly, “I will do every thing in my power (as a good Catholic ought) to upset that church as by law established; in other words, to sever church from state.” Now this is honest, and nobly free-spoken. It is clear, at least, that the Jesuits, who, it seems, have faithfully instructed Mr. Waterton in the King’s English, have likewise left him in full possession of an unperverted sense of right, and have made no inroads upon his integrity and simplicity of heart.

But for what purpose, it may be asked, do we produce such testimony as this? Certainly not for the purpose of imputing perjury to the thirty-five honorable Roman Catholic members who voted for the principle of appropriation. In truth, we would much rather not be called upon to pronounce any opinion upon this question of perjury, or no-perjury. It is an exceedingly awkward and invidious matter to handle. We must therefore leave those gentlemen to settle the point with their respective confessors. The affair is one which falls not within our jurisdiction. We produce this testimony, therefore, solely for the purpose of showing, that there are, even among the professors of the Romish faith, some individuals who consider the *severance* of church property from the Protestant establishment, *for any purpose whatever*, as an object prohibited and interdicted to all the sworn Catholic members of the imperial legislature: and further, that they so consider it, because it manifestly tends to the injury and eventual subversion of that church: in other words, because it amounts, in their judgment, to neither more nor less than manifest spoliation. And we have very little doubt that there are among the Roman Catholics of England and of Ireland many upright and honorable men, who, in their secret hearts, entertain precisely the same persuasion, although they may want the firmness, or perhaps the fitting opportunity, to say so much. And if this be so—if it be, among the Roman Catholics themselves, at all a doubtful matter, whether this *severance* be consistent or not with the constitution of church and state, as settled, first, by the Union, and, secondly, by the Catholic Relief Bill,—

what might we reasonably expect would be the conviction of every *Protestant* in the land? If there is a *Catholic* to be found who would fear to touch, *for any purpose whatever*, the revenues of the established church, lest he should lay the guilt of perjury on his soul, in what an odd condition must be the conscience of any man, not being a *Catholic*, who can pacify himself with the word *appropriation*, when such a "*severance*" is proposed to him as a wise, legitimate, and salutary measure!

But we greatly prefer leaving this part of the subject in the hands of Mr. Eneas Mac Donnell. And we accordingly insert, for the benefit of all whom they may concern, a collection of queries, which he has submitted to the digestion of his *Catholic* brethren. And we do conceive that his *Catholic* brethren are not, by any means, the only persons who may fitly be regarded as *concerned* in these interrogatories. For, be it observed, the whole of them are framed upon the confident assumption, that the Protestant church *must* be endangered by the subtraction of its property. Having first shown that the oath must be understood in the true spirit of the declarations made by the Catholics when they petitioned for relief, and that these declarations solemnly disclaimed all meditated injury to the Protestant establishment, he proceeds thus:—

"I feel a perfect, entire consciousness, that I have justified my sentiments. If, however, there still be others found to question, or to doubt, that I have furnished sufficient evidence to establish my right to entertain that conviction, I pray them to estimate the question as one of those, into the consideration of which we are not at liberty to admit any subordinate feelings of prejudice or predilection. Let them, before they make up their minds to a final judgment, consider, calmly and separately the following queries:—

- "1st.—If those declarations of Catholics, collectively and individually, lay and ecclesiastical, commencing in the year 1757, and carried down uniformly till 1829, were not made for the purposes which I state—Query, *for what purposes were they made?*
- "2nd.—If those declarations, addresses, copies of Catholic Oaths, petitions, tracts, and other publications of Catholic societies, and Catholic individuals, were not circulated for the purposes which I state—Query, *for what purposes were they circulated?*
- "3rd.—If the evidence given by Catholics, lay and ecclesiastical, before Committees of Parliament, was not given and circulated for the purposes which I state—Query, *for what purposes was it given and circulated?*
- "4th.—If the Catholic Oaths of 1793, and 1829, were not framed for the purpose which I state—Query, *for what purpose were they framed?*
- "5th.—If the object of Government and Parliament, in 1829, had been

to frame an Oath in accordance with the declarations, petitions, addresses, publications, and former oaths of the Catholics of both islands—Query, *must they not have framed a form of Oath conformable to the views which I profess to entertain?*

“ 6th.—If the object of Government and Parliament, in 1829, had been also to frame an Oath, calculated to remove the honest alarms, and calm the apprehensions of opponents, and to provide some security by form of Oath, to be taken by Catholic Members of Parliament, against the hostile exercise of their privileges, as such members, in interfering with the rights and privileges of the Church Establishment—Query, *is not it reasonable to suppose that they must have intended that the Oath which they framed should be interpreted according to my construction of its obligations?*

“ 7th.—If the Catholics had required that the Oath of 1829 should be so framed as to enable Catholic Members of both Houses to speak and vote in support of measures for the severance and appropriation of the Church property, or of any portion thereof—Query, *is it likely that the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and the other Members of the Government, at that time, would have framed and proposed to Parliament an Oath that would be intended by that Government to admit of such interpretation?*

“ 8th.—If the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel had candidly stated to the King and the two Houses of Parliament, that such was the intent and object of the Oath; as, no doubt, they must and would have done, if they had contemplated such a construction—Query, *is it probable or credible that the King or either House of Parliament would have adopted any form of Oath framed for such purpose, or have passed any Bill of Relief in which it would have been embodied?*”—p. 37—39.

We repeat, that we earnestly recommend these queries to the attention not only of all Roman Catholics, but of all Protestants throughout the empire. For we are at a loss to imagine how any Protestant can peruse them without being overpowered by the conviction, that *appropriation* is but a soft and dulcet word, the terrible meaning of which may speedily be disclosed in the ruin of the Protestant establishment, and perhaps in the fierce and bloody persecution of its members. For the further assistance, however, of Protestant consciences and understandings, we shall here introduce the closing sentences of Mr. Mac Donnell's publication:—

“ So far as to the Roman Catholic Members of the two Houses of Parliament. One word now as to the Protestant Members, or rather, to speak more correctly, I should, perhaps, say, those Members who are not Roman Catholics. Nothing could be more simple or speedy than the course which it is in the power of any one of them to pursue, who may question my views; moreover, he would possess the enormous advantage of having the most recent precedents in favour of that course. Let

a Member (not Roman Catholic) give notice, on the re-assembling of Parliament, in each House, that he will, on an early day, to be then fixed, "call the attention of the House" to the Roman Catholic Oath, and that he will move, also, for a "call of the House," and all that sort of thing, in the way of awful note of preparation. Let him, accordingly, on the day appointed, propose a Resolution to the following effect:—"That the Roman Catholic Oath contained in the Catholic Relief Act of 1829 was not intended to be any security to the Church Establishment, or to control Roman Catholic Members of either House of Parliament, in the exercise of their privilege of voting or speaking in Parliament; or to guard against their introducing or supporting any resolution or other measure for altering the present settlement of the Church Property, or severing any portion thereof from the Church Establishment."

"Without inconveniently embarrassing the House of Lords, by any reference to their judgment on the matter, it might, perhaps, be considered just as well to leave it altogether to the Commons and the Crown; and an Address to his Majesty might be moved, or, at least, threatened, humbly, most humbly, of course, submitting the above Resolution to his Majesty's most gracious consideration, and soliciting, but not at all demanding, the Royal assent thereto.

"There are some very peculiar reasons why I should look forward with more than common curiosity to the speeches of some of his Majesty's present Ministers on the occasion, and to the Royal reply which would be given under their advice."—p. 41, 42.

If our space allowed it, we might here advert pretty much at length to Mr. Mac Donnell's second pamphlet, his "Further Consideration of the Roman Catholic Oath." It is, if possible, still more worthy of perusal than his first. We have only room for two short extracts. The following is the language in which that gentleman states the final result of his own meditations on the subject:—

"Deeply impressed with all these considerations, after having read over every official letter which I ever received from the Roman Catholics of Ireland;—having also examined about twenty volumes of Catholic tracts, and several of my own private memorandum-books, and calmly deliberated upon your letter, and every other objection that has been raised, according to my knowledge, to the opinions which I have expressed, I feel not only unshaken, but on the contrary, more than ever confirmed, in the justice of those opinions."—p. 22.

To this we must add his very important postscript:—

"Having hitherto endeavoured to avoid mixing up the great question of the actual *obligations* of the Roman Catholic oath with any other topics, such as the consequences, good or evil, that may be supposed, by opposite parties, to result from any particular interpretation of its terms, I have determined to adhere, at least in the present publication, to the same course, although much tempted, if not provoked, to sweep away

some of the many delusions practised upon the present occasion. Suffice it to say, that if you should consider my views, as expressed in this pamphlet, tolerably well sustained, I am fully as well prepared to maintain, *and to prove*, that the resolution adopted on the motion of Lord John Russell, as explained by that noble lord and his friends, *neither tends, nor appears to be intended, to secure peace or prosperity to my country; nor, in the slightest degree, to benefit the peasantry of Ireland.* I feel no desire to intrude my reasons for these opinions, but if he should require them, he shall have them; and whatever other claims they may possess to his attention, he will have the satisfaction of knowing, that they are the opinions and reasons of one, who, in the time of need, has practically laboured more, suffered more, and done more on behalf of that peasantry, than any one of his lordship's Irish Catholic parliamentary supporters or, peradventure, all of them put together."—p. 22, 24.

Once—twice—and thrice, then, we beseech the Protestant subjects of the king to ponder, deeply and patiently, on the case exhibited by these two pamphlets. Here is a zealous and indefatigable Romanist, once the honored* and confidential agent of his Roman Catholic countrymen, solemnly warning his brethren against the guilt of joining in any design against the Protestant Church. If one man can be found, at this day, whose brain is altogether unclouded by the fumes of party-spirit,—we would ask that man, whether this single fact does not speak volumes to the ear of the intelligent and the upright? We are pretty well aware, indeed, of what many a Protestant *appropriator* will be prepared to say to all this. "Why"—he will ask—"are we to surrender up our judgment to the fantastic scruples of a nervous *Catholic*, 'a man of aspen conscience,' who affects to be more wise and righteous than his neighbours? Only just consider what it is that we mean to do. Nothing is further from our thoughts than to imitate that monster of sacrilege, Henry VIII., and his harpy swarm of courtiers. Not a layman in the land will be the richer for our dealings with the *superfluities* of the Protestant Church. There shall be no building up of noble houses, out of the ruins of the establishment. No; we will build up nothing but schools. We will educate the people, both Romanist and Protestant; and thereby we will dissolve the spell which, for ages, has kept the Romanist in a state of the vilest thralldom, and has disabled the Protestant Church from achieving the triumph of scriptural truth." Such is the grave indoctrination, which we occasionally hear

* Mr. Mac Donnell has subjoined to his second pamphlet a long list of testimonies to his zeal, and talent, and fidelity, and, among them, the acknowledgments of no less than twenty-four Irish Roman Catholic Bishops; most of which acknowledgments are crammed with professions of Roman Catholic *gratitude*. And yet Mr. Mac Donnell is not a member of the Imperial Parliament! His qualmish integrity, it may be presumed, might be found rather troublesome in that assembly. The times require brave and heroic *stomachs*, that cannot easily be turned.

delivered with a perfectly serious countenance, in private. And loud are the cheers with which the same exposition of reforming policy is often hailed, in public. And miserable is the length of visage, with which these oracles of wisdom and liberality are listened to by many a respectable and well-meaning friend of established order, who suspects that there must be something false and hollow in it all, though his sagacity may not be keen and quick enough to unravel the nonsense and the sophistry. It is highly important, however, that this matter should be made clear, as the saying is, *to the very humblest capacity*. And, for this end, we beg permission, in the first place, once more, and at the hazard of weariness, to remind the good people who may be “perplexed in the extreme” by their plausible antagonists, that there is in the realm one Romanist at least,—(a *fastidiously* honest Romanist he may be thought by some, but still a Romanist)—who has written two pamphlets for the express purpose of proclaiming to his fellow religionists in parliament, that the *severance* of property from the Protestant establishment is, to them, an object of forbidden agitation,—*be the purposes of that severance what they may*;—and has, further, declared his conviction, that the appropriating resolution is a downright mockery, and is destitute of all tendency to benefit the starving peasantry of Ireland. Mr. Eneas Mac Donnell may be right, or he may be wrong. But still the fact remains,—that there is one Roman Catholic—(we doubt not that, in secret, there are thousands)—who is more *fastidious*, as to this matter, than many a Protestant dealer in reform and agitation; one Roman Catholic who would laugh, in utter scorn, if he were to hear of *general education*, as the “flattering unction” by which the lancinating pains of conscience are to be assuaged, when the hand of *appropriation* shall be laid upon Protestant Church revenues. This is one weighty and important consideration. But,

In the second place,—let us put one question to every man who retains a spark of attachment to the Anglo-Catholic Church established in this realm. Let us suppose that the Legislature were to say to the English branch of that Church—“We think you are too rich. We apprehend that your stall-fed divines are too many, and too comfortable; and, moreover, that you have many a rector who is far better off than may besem a priest. We are satisfied that a process of reduction would be extremely salutary both to them and to the Church. This reduction would place a considerable surplus at *our* disposal. And how could we apply it better than to the purposes of education? We will not insist, however, upon your educating Roman Catholics. In this country, their number is comparatively small. But we are quite resolved that you shall educate your own people. And, with that

view, we shall, at our convenience, take care to ascertain what funds can be spared, for that purpose, from your own resources." Suppose the Legislature were to say this to the *English Church*. They might, indeed, call it *appropriation*. But is there a sound-hearted and well-informed Church of England man who would not, instantly, supply a fitter name to the proceeding? Is there an honest man among us, whose feelings and principles would not start up, in vehement insurrection, against the tyranny, which should say, "We know your property was given for the support of the sacred profession, and for the maintenance of the worship of God. But, nevertheless, we have come to the resolution, that, *whether you will or not*, such portion of it as we please shall be employed in the building of schools, and the payment of school-masters?" Does it not, then, exceed all ordinary patience to listen calmly, when we are told that the Irish Church, with her now starving Clergy, are to be amerced to some indefinite extent; and this, too, not for the purpose of *Protestant* education, but for the purposes of spreading "*general education*"—that is, *neutral education*—"among all classes of the people, without distinction of "religious persuasion?"

But, thirdly, we often hear it affirmed, that, let the Church's *abstract* right to her possessions be what it may, there is now a case of overpowering necessity before us. The people of Ireland are ignorant; and educated they *must* be. And what property so fit to contribute largely towards their education, as that which was originally given for pious and moral purposes? This reasoning appears, at first sight, strong; and, to some, it may appear irresistible. But Sir Robert Peel has demolished it.

"I hold in my hand," says the illustrious baronet, "a report made on education by an authority to which the honourable members opposite will, I have no doubt, be inclined to pay the utmost deference; that authority being no less than the right honourable gentleman (Mr. S. Rice) himself. The report was made so lately as the year 1828. It reviewed the whole of the previous reports on education—it embraced some twenty-three resolutions—it contained a specific reference to the act of Henry VIII.; but not one word is said in the whole of that report, from beginning to end, with respect to education being a pecuniary charge on the Church of Ireland. The right honourable gentleman neither proposed the application of church revenues to defray the charge of education, *nor was he then an advocate for gratuitous education*. Now, you are about to decide that question also by your vote; you are about to decide that education shall be gratuitous in Ireland. I ask you seriously to consider the importance of this principle. I ask you to pause before you sanction it. *There are, in my mind, the gravest and most serious grounds of doubt with respect to its propriety and expediency*. I utterly deny the possibility of applying any such sum as 200,000*l.* an-

nually to education in Ireland without doing much more harm than good. Here is the right honourable gentleman's own report in 1828. I will not refer to it at any length, but the purport of it is to recommend the plan of the noble lord (Stanley), which was adopted by the House of Commons; but not one word does it contain of the pecuniary charge, which he now asserts rests on the Irish Church revenues for purposes of education. On the contrary, here is one of his own resolutions—'That it is the opinion of this committee that parliamentary aid for the establishment and support of schools in Ireland should be for the future restricted, in granting aid to parishes, to two-thirds of the sum required;' and then follow details of the manner in which the local assessment should be raised, the principal object being to invite individual contributions and assistance towards the erection and superintendence of the schools. This was a wise principle. It was not recommended by economy alone. It proclaimed the great truth, that those who hold property have duties attached to the possession of it, and are bound by local ties to attend to local interests. It established the best link between the rich and the poor. It gave to the rich an interest in the condition of the poor—it confirmed in the poor a feeling of respect and gratitude towards the rich. *I do not hesitate to say, that even if you had the money to apply, you would do more harm than good, if you were to relieve the clergy and gentlemen of Ireland from the duty of paying that attention to local matters which those in England are accustomed to pay, from the necessity of local contributions, and local exertions in the cause of local education.*—pp. 32—34.

Again;—

"As to the application of the supposed surplus revenues I entreat you, from the interest you take in education, not to decide that question at present. If you had the surplus you suppose, nothing could be so unwise as to pledge yourselves to-night on this point. It excludes all after-consideration whether education shall be gratuitous or stipendiary. *I bring you very great authorities against the principle of gratuitous education.* This very commission, to which I have already alluded, whose opinions the right hon. gentleman so highly values, and whose authority he ought to appreciate, this very commission states,—'We had in the course of our inspection been much struck with the state of many schools in which the pupils paid for the instruction they received, and in which there appeared to be perfect harmony amongst children of all persuasions. These schools were carried on as objects of private speculation, and not supported either by public funds or by the aid of societies. Each child was taught the religion which its parents wished it to learn.' You are assuming that no education at all exists in Ireland, while there never was a country in which there existed more superabundant means of education. This commission again states, 'As to the funds for the maintenance of the new parochial schools, we recommend that they should be derived partly from the state, partly from parochial assessments, and partly from payments by the pupils.' Looking to the results of our own personal examination into schools of all descriptions, to the

practical effects of the system so long and so beneficially in operation in Scotland, we are satisfied that the schools should be founded on the principle of pay-schools, and that the payment should go to the master and the usher. At what sum the rate of payment should be fixed, must depend upon local circumstances. By appointing in certain situations a higher rate of contribution, a most eligible class of schools may readily be provided, with instruction suitable to a better description of persons. Although in all cases, payment by each scholar should be the rule, we recommend that there should be lodged in certain individuals, a power of dispensing with the payment, and of admitting, as an exception, certain free scholars. *Payment, however, should be the rule, and gratuitous instruction the exception.* Observe, these recommendations in favour of pay-schools are given, not to save public money, but because the principle of pay-schools is preferred to that of gratuitous education. Now, is it not prudent to enquire, before we affirm the principle that a portion of church revenue should be applied, should be limited also to a given object,—What is the amount which that object will require? I complain that you can form no sort of estimate on that subject. You are in utter ignorance respecting it. You don't know the amount of the surplus; you don't know the extent of the demands on it. I charge you with the absurdity of coming to a resolution without the shadow of a ground on which to form any thing like a rational opinion.”—pp. 38—41.

Let any one, then, who has carefully perused these passages, ask himself, where is the overpowering necessity for (*plundering* the Church we suppose we must not say, but for) easing the Church of what are called her *superfluities*? Sir R. Peel knows Ireland well: and he tells us that “there never was a country in which there existed more superabundant means of education; and that education would only be encumbered and impeded by the contemplated grant.” Mr. Spring Rice too, it is to be presumed, knows Ireland well: and he, till very lately, was no friend to the *gratuitous* education of the Irish people. Nay, on the contrary, he still swears by a Commission which pronounces an encomium on *pay-schools*, and expressly recommends that “payment should be the rule, and gratuitous instruction the exception.” Where then, we demand again, is the *overpowering necessity*? And where is the wisdom, or the sincerity, of those who raise an outcry on the strength of it?

But, fourthly, it is often and constantly averred, that without incurring the infamy of plunder, the State may appropriate superfluous church-revenue to purposes strictly *Ecclesiastical*: and who can deny, it is asked, that the education of the people is an *Ecclesiastical* purpose? Mr. S. Rice declared that he would prove it so to be, on the authority of—King Henry VIII.! The authority of King Henry VIII. was somewhat ominous. It called up, unavoidably, certain awkward remem-

branches of spoliation. It turns out, however, that after all, King Henry VIII. himself could afford no assistance whatever to Mr. S. Rice. And this was shown—by whom? by Sir Robert Peel? Not only by him, but by those very commissioners whom Mr. Spring Rice is never weary of extolling. Hear the matter stated by Sir Robert Peel himself.

“ My assertion, I repeat, is, that the object of the act of Henry VIII. was superintendence, while the right honourable gentleman maintains that it was contribution. Now the right honourable gentleman had a great many small slips of paper, which he read with great effect in the course of his speech. He alluded to the report of a commission which we had appointed many years since, to which he attached the greatest importance, and which consisted of Mr. Frankland Lewis, Mr. Leslie Forster, Mr. Blake, a Roman Catholic gentleman; Mr. Glassford, and Mr. W. Grant, an English barrister: but, amidst all the extracts which he adduced for the purpose of proving that the principle of contribution was established by the statute of Henry VIII., there was one, apparently a very material one, which, somehow or other, seems to have unluckily escaped his notice. Speaking of that very statute, and its bearing on this very subject—these commissioners—so deserving of all confidence—declare—‘ It is obvious to us that the intention of the statute of Henry VIII. was *not pecuniary contribution, but superintendence*; and that it did impose the latter duty. This act, after reciting, among other things, ‘ the importance of a good instruction in the most blessed laws of Almighty God,’ and further reciting His Majesty’s disposition and zeal, that ‘ a certain direction and order be had, that all we, his subjects, should the better know God, and do that thing that might in time be and redound to our wealth, quiet, and commodity,’ proceeds, after a variety of enactments tending to the suppression of the Irish and the introduction of the English language and customs, to require an oath to be administered to every clergyman at ordination, and another at institution, that, amongst other things, ‘ he should keep, or cause to be kept, within the place, territory, or parish where he shall have the pre-eminence, rule, benefice, or promotion, a school for to learn English, if any children of his parish come to him to learn the same, taking for the keeping of the same school, such convenient stipend or salary as in the said land is accustomed to be given.’ What, then, becomes of the argument that the act of Henry VIII., and the whole tenour of subsequent statutes, authorised the application of the ecclesiastical revenues in Ireland to general instruction unconnected with that Church? The argument is wholly without foundation, and the whole history and tenor of the statutes show, that, so far from being at variance with the principle of an establishment, or authorising the application of the ecclesiastical revenues to the purposes of mere general instruction, unconnected with the Established Church, their object was to connect education with the church, and fortify the principle of an establishment.” pp. 36—38.

It is clear, then, that Henry VIII. refuses to be pressed into the service. Nay, the enlightened Commissioners themselves are

downright traitors to their admirer. Their interpretation sweeps away the ground clean from beneath his feet. We must wait, therefore, for some other *authority*, to satisfy us that the education of Papists is an object strictly ecclesiastical, and may rightly claim a portion of the revenues of a Protestant Establishment.

Lastly, however, who is there that can witness, without feelings which it would be disagreeable to describe, the puffings and the trumpetings of this miserable *nostrum* of "*General Education*," as the grand specific for all the ills of Ireland; or, at all events, as the regimen which must precede the application of every other remedy? Why, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say, that one-fourth of the people of Ireland are starving. The rebellion, there, is the most desperate of all rebellions,—“the rebellion of the belly.” A moral and spiritual famine, doubtless, there may be among them. But there is a hungering and a thirsting of a coarser nature, which must be satisfied, before the cravings of the soul can demand attention, or, indeed, before any such cravings can arise. “Nature forbids that you should make a wise and virtuous people, out of a famishing people.” And this, as it would seem, is a truth, which is beginning to make itself felt and respected: for the Agitator himself has recently given notice of a measure for the introduction of a Poor Law into Ireland. What may be the Agitator’s *real* design in taking a step, from which, till now, he has obstinately held back, we shall not attempt to divine,—for his policy is, at all times, a bottomless pit. Neither shall we venture on any opinion as to the probable success and usefulness of this measure. We mention the fact, simply to show that lack of bread, rather than lack of knowledge, is, now, virtually acknowledged to be the *immediate* monster-evil of that wretched country. And if such a law should be introduced, it will be fit and righteous that the property of the Church (if the clergy should ever emerge from pauperism themselves) should contribute, like all other property, its full contingent to the relief of the national misery; for human *stomachs* are neither Protestant nor Popish. In the mean while, however, the Protestant Church of Ireland is threatened with confiscation; and all for what?—that the half-starved millions may be pacified and made happy by the invigorating diet of an *abstract principle*, to be realized, heaven knows when, in the form of *general instruction*, without distinction of religious persuasion!

“Aut hæc in nostros fabricata est machina muros;
Aut aliquis latet error.”

Either this is a treacherous design against our Protestant establishment; or else it is a prodigy of infatuation, such as, we hope,

has not often disgraced the counsels of legislators, or of statesmen.

One most important view of this vexed and vexatious question still remains to be considered. It is, sometimes, demanded in a tone of bitter triumph, what has the Protestant establishment done for Ireland? Has it advanced the Protestant faith? Has it been able to maintain its own ground against the predominant genius of Romanism? Have not the Protestant congregations been wasting and dwindling for the last three centuries, till, in many parts of the country, the Protestant Church is a mere *nominis umbra*; the empty unsubstantial εἰδωλον of a departed reality? Has not the Reformation, in short, been an ignominious failure, throughout all but a contemptible minority, a poor fraction, of the Irish community? And these questions are asked by those very men, who are eternally protesting that they have no other object, under heaven, but to preserve the Church in its fullest efficacy and honor; and that, if they venture to lop off its exuberance, it is only in order that, henceforth, it may flourish with augmented vigour. The Protestant establishment, we are sometimes told, is no less than a positive insult to a nation essentially *Catholic*; and yet we are assured, in the same breath, that its reformers are anxious for nothing so much as for the effectual promotion of its stability and usefulness: and that, this being once accomplished by the *severance* of a portion of its property, *the settlement is to be final*. Does it require the acumen of an Œdipus to read this riddle? One Œdipus, at least, there is, who has read it rightly. Let us listen to his interpretation: "You may attempt as you please"—says Sir Robert Peel—"to film over the gulph which separates the noble lord and some of those by whom he is supported. But you are only deceiving yourselves. The people of Ireland will read your speeches and your arguments, in which the Protestant establishment is described as *a nuisance and a badge of conquest*, and they will laugh at your resolution, and your frivolous attempts to limit your new principle of appropriation, by reference to the Acts of Henry VIII., and declarations that education, unconnected with the Church, is an *Ecclesiastical* purpose. Talk of this as a settlement of the question! What have been the arguments by which the resolution was supported? Let us shortly review them."—He then produces specimens of *argument*, from the speeches of the appropriators: in which the Irish Church is proclaimed to be *destitute of all tendency to promote religion and good order*,—is declared to be merely a *badge of conquest*, forced on the people by superior power, which it is but natural that they should wish to throw off, at the first favourable opportunity,—is

described as *an unwarrantable infliction on their consciences and resources*,—and denounced as a *great national iniquity, in favor of which no prescription can be urged, against the cries of a people, which become, in effect, the voice of God!* Having finished his recital of *appropriating* rhetoric, Sir Robert proceeds thus:—

“Now, then, I ask you whether this resolution, supported by these arguments, can possibly lay the foundation of a *final settlement*?—I am now looking into the womb of time, and am as certain of what it will produce, as I am of any thing in the history of the past. I feel as certain as that I am standing here, that the honourable member is too manly not to declare that he is not satisfied with this principle. He does not, in this measure, meditate a final settlement. You cannot meditate it either. I therefore will not consent to appropriate this property, which is ecclesiastical, and connected with the Protestant establishment, to other purposes than those of that establishment. I will not assent to your resolution, because I know how worthless and delusive it is; *because I know that it is a measure which sends into Ireland, not peace, but a sword.* It will excite in that unhappy country false hopes—hopes which you cannot realise, and yet hopes which you will shrink from disappointing. It will unsettle those foundations of property which are built upon prescription, and which are more secure than those on which you are erecting your new system of *spoliation*.”—p. 49, 50.

Is it possible that any sane man can meditate upon these things, without perceiving that the Irish Church is herself, in fact, the giant-grievance; and that what is called the *surplus* of her wealth, is but as the skirt of her robe, by grasping which the adversary will strive to bring her down? We know not how it may be with others: but it seems to us as if we could, at this moment, behold the *Abstract Principle* expanding before our eyes, and assuming form and substance, and growing into the likeness of an ugly and ravenous Harpy, ready to fly upon the prey with fang and talon. And, such being our visions, it makes us smile in bitterness, to hear the gentle patrons of appropriation describing it rather as a harmless dove,—the messenger of peace, and good will, and brotherly affection, and oblivion of religious differences; the harbinger, in short, of “*final settlement!*” A *final settlement*, indeed, we all may look for; a *settlement*, we fear, such as is usually made by that “*stern divider of possessions, that fierce umpire of strife,—the sword.*” What other arbitrament can any man look for,—unless he be one, who is content to drug himself with “the consolations which Bedlam gives to Philosophy,

* — κτεάνων χρηματοδαίτας
πικρὸς, ἀμείψων σίδαρος·

πικρὸς δ' οὗτος
νικίων. Æschylus.

“and which Philosophy gives back to Bedlam.” Were we not told, in 1833, that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland would be placed in imminent hazard by the prosecution of this “shadow of a claim;” and told it, too, by that very man, who now dictates to us that “there can be no *satisfactory and final adjustment*, “which does not embody the principle of appropriation,” and so pledges the government to the prosecution of that very claim? And is not the “Viceroy over the government” proclaiming, all this while, that *no* satisfactory and final adjustment can possibly be the result of this “half-faced” measure of *justice*?—“Let us “but promise to strip off the luxurious trappings, and gorgeous “superfluities of the Church, and all will be satisfactorily and “finally adjusted:”—so says the *Head* of the government. But what says *the Tail*? Is it not *rattling* most audibly and most intelligibly, to this effect,—that, “let tithes be demanded, to any “amount however small, or in any form that can be imagined,—“let them be levied on landlord, or on tenant,—it matters not; “whiteboyism must be the inevitable consequence?” Here, then, we have his Majesty’s Ministers talking of a *surplus*: while his Majesty’s *Repealers* are loudly proclaiming that there shall be *no surplus*,—(simply because there shall, eventually, be nothing, or next to nothing, from which a surplus can be taken,)—and that outrage, and bloodshed, and incendiarism, must be the consequence of any attempt to realize the thing to be appropriated. It is true that, in spite of all this, the Tail was active *for* appropriation, on the floor of the House of Commons: for it was something gained, to weaken and to mutilate the detested object, which is ultimately to be crushed. But nothing, we think, can be more clear than these three things,—first, that the destruction of that detested object is the only *final settlement* towards which the movements of the Tail are directed,—secondly, that this settlement can hardly be effected without a desperate struggle which we fear to think upon,—and, lastly, that the assertion of the “Abstract Principle,” if it does any thing, will only strengthen the desperate hands by which, sooner or later, the final settlement may be attempted.

Did not Sir Robert Peel, then, do well to declare, that “a “stronger, a truer, and an honester declaration, would have been “better, since this first deduction from church revenues would “only be accepted as an instalment of that whole amount which “is held in contemplation?”—(p. 47.) Did he not do well to ask—“Why is it that the noble lord and his friends have not “brought in a bill? Are they uncertain of their plan? Are they “ashamed of presenting, in the ordinary course, the result of “their solemn and mature deliberation? Do they shrink from “producing that detailed plan which they have so deeply and so

“anxiously considered?”—(p. 51.) And why, we may venture to add, why was not some measure proposed which would at once have brought before the public the whole question relative to the expediency of giving further maintenance to *any* Protestant Establishment in Ireland? If it be a matter of doubt, whether the Irish Church be a beneficial institution, or whether it be only a *badge of conquest*, and a *great national iniquity*, would it not be more honest, and more wise, to bring that question directly to a decision, instead of marking out the Church as a sacrifice, by a series of insults, which tend to strip it of all dignity and influence, and so to deprive it of all effectual defence?

And here we may be allowed a word or two touching the grave impeachment brought against the Irish Church, as an establishment which has not been very prosperous in anything, except in the imputed amount of its revenues. This impeachment has been openly and frankly met by Sir Robert Peel, (p. 20, &c.) He has affected no blindness to the fact, that, as yet, the Church in Ireland is unable to boast of having been the honoured instrument of delivering the people from the dominion of the Romish Priesthood, and of giving free course to the Reformed Faith throughout the land. It would require a much more elaborate retrospect than our space will allow, to search out the causes of this unhappy failure. We are strongly persuaded, however, that such an inquiry, if honestly pursued, would go far to show that her want of success has, for the most part, been rather her misfortune than her fault. In spite of the *alleged* enormity of her wealth, the Irish Church has, till of late, been beset by a legion of almost overwhelming disadvantages. Among the foremost of these may justly be reckoned the peculiarly ferocious type of Irish Romanism. In many other countries, the genius of the Romish religion is rebuked, and partially overruled, by a variety of corrective influences; by greater maturity of civilization, by the gentle operation of more refined manners, by a larger infusion of the elements of the Reformation into the public mind, or, lastly, by the force and pressure of the sovereign power. But, throughout a great portion of Ireland, Catholicism, unhappily, exhibits the fiercest combination of barbarism and superstition, each acting and re-acting upon the other, and thus perpetually *evolving* a spirit of intense and desperate malignity. The Reformed Faith, in that country, may be said, almost without a figure, to be walking in the midst of the *burning fiery furnace*; and the chief wonder is, that it has not been utterly consumed. But, besides the violence which it has had to endure from its enemies, there is another fatal mischief with which, for a long period, it has been visited by its *friends*—namely, a most profligate *political* abuse of

patronage. We fear that it would be found, on examination, that this one evil alone might do much to explain the stationary, or even retrograde, condition of the Protestant Faith in that ill-fated country. But who, that has the heart of a Protestant in his bosom, can endure the thought of throwing up the contest in despair—of dismantling the fortress of Scriptural truth and Apostolic discipline—and of surrendering the land, for all time to come, to the possession of an adversary, whose rule is fatal to all hope of civilization and prosperity, and, as we believe, at mortal variance with the simplicity which is in Christ? We cannot but persuade ourselves that better times would be in store for the Irish Church, if the heart of our legislature was right towards her. Her clergy are now among the most zealous, exemplary, and intelligent in the empire. If ever there was a time when she deserved protection and encouragement, it is now. She asks for no support in a system of wrong. We doubt not that she would gladly concur with any government, which should manifest towards her a spirit of frankness and good faith, in the suppression of every practice, and the correction of every abuse, which may have hitherto obstructed the progress of her doctrines. Besides, it should be recollected that she has now no longer to encounter that delicate sense of honour which, in former days, may have helped to defeat her efforts for the dissemination of her purer faith. The civil disabilities of the Roman Catholics are now at an end. Conversion is now no longer open to the imputation of low and secular motives. No worldly honour or emolument is to be gained by change of creed; so that argument and persuasion will be left to do their work more freely and hopefully than ever. In the mean time, there is another consideration—of very subordinate importance, it is true—but yet of too much moment to be altogether discarded. If the Irish clergy were proscribed, and their revenues confiscated, what is there to fill up the breach which would thus be left in the fabric of Irish society? The land, we all know, is crying out against her *absentees*, with an exceeding great and bitter cry; but it cries in vain. The absentees are deaf, and the law is dumb. The evil is beyond the reach of legislation. But the clergy, taken as a body, are permanently resident upon their cures; and, if they were not, the legislature would be all-powerful to compel their residence. What, then, would the people gain by the banishment, or by the ruinous impoverishment, of the clergy, but a calamitous aggravation of the evils of absenteeism? If they did nothing else, the parochial incumbents would still form a body of humbler gentlemen, performing all the kind and useful offices which are usually expected from the proprietors of the land, expending their incomes in the

local encouragement of industry, and gladdening their neighbourhoods by the example of beneficence, and order, and piety. But this is a matter which has been so often and so powerfully urged, that we abstain from further inculcation of it. We could not, however, properly forbear to claim for it that attention which the enemies of the Church, in general, find it most convenient to withhold. In estimating the value of the Establishment, it would be most unrighteous, and most unwise, to forget the benefits which the country has derived from the rescue of a certain portion of her produce from indolent and useless consumption, and, in many cases, from pernicious and unfeeling prodigality. These benefits, we are quite aware, are only collateral to higher and more sacred purposes; but still these benefits, in our sober judgment, would be, alone, sufficient to make the preservation of the Church an object of the weightiest national importance.

One honourable member* there was, who, in the course of the debates upon this question, professed himself satisfied that the Church of Ireland must, to the end of time, remain useless, unless she were to put off her present form of *pride*, and to put on more of the missionary guise and aspect. “He would send through Ireland a number of Protestant clergymen, whose zeal should supply the place of wealth, and who, by the exercise of disinterestedness, and the exhibition of poverty, should conciliate towards themselves those feelings of kindness and respect which have been nearly extinguished by the noxious exhibition of worldly wealth.” —(*Peel*, p. 27.) There is something inexpressibly repulsive in these recommendations of poverty, from the lips of opulence. But let that pass. How the *pampered* clergy of Ireland can endure poverty, when Providence is pleased to send it, we at this moment see. If their adversaries are resolved to deny them the credit of *knowing how to abound*, the last few years have shown, at any rate, that they *know how to suffer need*. This feature of the missionary character, at least, they have exhibited to the world; and the spectacle is one that no man, unless the fires of political strife have seared his heart, can look upon without admiration. The Irish clergy have seen their families suffering privations from which the humblest menials of the honourable member in question would shrink with disdain; and all has been endured with a meek forbearance, which ought to win affection towards themselves, and respect, if nothing more, towards the faith which they profess; and which possibly may “predispose the public mind to receive the salutary influence of a pure and tolerant faith.” —(*Peel*, p. 23.) With regard to the project of substituting for the ministrations of a stationary and allocated clergy, the itinerant and

* Mr. F. Buxton.

discursive zeal of a purely Missionary Church, it would be easy to show that the objections to it are numerous and insurmountable. But we have here no inclination to discuss the matter. The scheme is one which is not likely to find favour in the sight of any party. It is condemned by Sir Robert Peel, and by all who adopt his views of Irish policy. It is condemned, with still greater vehemence, by those of the contrary part. Nothing, we are perpetually told by them, could be more fatal to all hope of the conversion of Ireland, than the exhibition of busy and unguarded zeal. At one time, as all must recollect, the Protestants of Ireland were much disposed to a course of active and aggressive exertion against the errors and corruptions of Popery. And what was their reward? The cautious and the prudent shook their heads; the worldly and the *liberal* raised an outcry against the mischief of fanaticism; and, to this day, the attempt to win proselytes, by the circulation of the Bible, or the dispersion of Scripture-readers, is often met with galling derision, or scowled upon with positive aversion. If poverty, indeed, were the only requisite for a Missionary Church, there are numbers who would gladly make the Church *as missionary* as heart can wish! But the undisciplined energies of the missionary system would be deprecated by many of the wise and good, and would be loudly hooted at by those of a different description. Looking, therefore, at the question in this respect, we may spare ourselves the labour of examining Mr. Fowell Buxton's especial reasons for disbanding or impoverishing the Protestant Establishment.

So much, then, for the case which is brought before us, by the appropriating resolutions of the Commons' House of Parliament. But we must not let the occasion pass, without a sentence or two upon the more general principle which those resolutions manifestly involve. There are few questions which have given rise to more perplexing and inconclusive debate, than the right of the legislature to dispose of corporate property, or of ecclesiastical property. To us, we confess, the enquiry appears to be almost nugatory and unmeaning: for, when power is exercised by an *ultimate* constitutional depositary of power, power and right become, unavoidably, identified. The constitutional legislature, whether comprised in the person of one individual, or of a number of individuals, may do many foolish things, and many atrocious things. But we are unable to comprehend how it can be chargeable with exceeding the constitutional limits of its authority. To our apprehensions, it is no less than a manifest absurdity to debate about the mere abstract *rights*, either of an irresponsible man, or of an irresponsible body of men. But, although this be so, — there still may arise occasions which will call forth expres-

sions of contempt and indignation from the people, and impel them to speak as if the supreme government had been guilty of violating not only the laws of God, but the laws of man. We, sometimes, hear of legal robbery and judicial murder. And, after the same manner of *common parlance*, a tyrannical and rapacious monarch may, justly enough, be called the plunderer of his people; and so may a tyrannical and rapacious parliament. And, in such cases, the only question is, whether the acts of the monarch, or the parliament, are such, as virtuous, reflecting, and intelligent men, would pronounce to be tainted with the *moral* guilt of injustice and of robbery: a question which may very fitly be discussed; but which, of course, can be brought to no *authoritative* decision.

In matters of this kind, however, public opinion is often found to exercise a jurisdiction, which, practically, controls the power of the legislature itself. Thus—public opinion has invested property with a sort of sacro-sanctity. “There is such divinity doth hedge it,” that, for the most part, confiscation “can but peep at what it would.” And yet, there are emergencies, when even the property of individuals is not held altogether sacred; and when the sacredness of property falls before the still more overpowering sacredness of the Public Interest. If this were otherwise, the formation of Canals, and Rail-roads, and the improvement of cities, and other great national works, would be rendered impracticable. The owner of the property wanted for the public good, is, therefore, called upon to suffer,—with the best grace he may,—not a total loss, indeed, but, perhaps, to him a very severe partial loss. For he is *compelled* to accept such compensation as a jury may award him. And, it may happen, that no pecuniary compensation can completely re-instate him.

With regard to property held in trust, or under conditions express or implied, the legislature may be allowed to exercise its powers with something less of doubt and hesitation, than where the ownership is absolute and unconditional. But, even in these instances, property does not lose its sacredness. Public opinion, unless grievously perverted, will always forbid an arbitrary and wanton invasion. It will pronounce that nothing can *morally* justify any serious aggression upon such property, but a clear case of necessity—a demand, on the part of the public welfare, which shall approve itself to the conviction—not of a clamorous and discontented section, however strong in numbers—but to the conviction of all honest and enlightened men.

In order to illustrate this, let us imagine that a National Church were in possession of property to an amount so enormous, that the wise and the good throughout the land should, with one voice,

pronounce its wealth to be a nuisance, and proclaim that it perniciously obstructed the developement of the national resources, and fatally impaired the moral and spiritual efficiency of the Sacred Order itself. And let us further imagine that the Church should place the public opinion at defiance, and obstinately refuse to enter into any compromise with the State. In a case like this, it will scarcely be denied by the most scrupulous vindicator of the rights of property, that the maxim, *Salus Populi suprema Lex*, might come into legitimate application; and that the state might appropriate, even to secular uses, such portion of the overgrown revenue as could be spared, after a *liberal and ample* provision for the support of the Clergy, for the maintenance of Divine worship, and for the spiritual edification of the people. And if this were done by the State in a righteous, equitable, and considerate spirit, and with a fit regard to existing interests,—it would be unfair to call the process by the odious name of pillage, or spoliation.

A parallel to the case above supposed, is probably, at this moment, to be found in Spain. Something like it occurred in Scotland, and even in England, at the period of the Reformation. But then,—the manner in which the evil was redressed, both in Scotland and in England, was notoriously such, as to fix upon the secular powers the blackest infamy which can attach to sacrilegious plunder.*

By following out the train of thought above suggested, we shall easily perceive how utterly impossible it is to limit the mere abstract right of the legislature, or to construct any *general* rule which shall determine when the exercise of that right is, or is not, morally chargeable with the guilt of robbery. There is, evidently, no imaginable approximation to any such general rule, except that which we have stated,—namely, that the supreme power should withhold its hand from property of any description, until an imperious necessity for touching it shall be *irresistibly* made out. In estimating that necessity, the voice of party, of faction, of personal interest, of religious enthusiasm, or irreligious fanaticism,—all must be resolutely shut out. If these be allowed to

* With regard to Scotland, hear the words of John Knox himself:—"Assuredly "some of us have considered how men that possessed godliness, could of so long continuance, bear the threatenings of God against *thieves*, and against their houses, and "knowing themselves guilty of such things as were openly rebuked; and that they "never had remorse of conscience, neither yet intended to restore any thing of that, "which long they had *stolen* and kept. *There were none within the realm so unmerciful* "to poor ministers, than (as) were they who had the greatest rents of the Kirkes."—*Knox's Historic*, p. 160, quoted in *Dr. Russell's Hist. of the Church in Scotland*, vol. i. p. 257. It is notorious that John Knox died almost broken-hearted at the merciless and execrable voracity of the Aristocratical robbers of the Church.

influence its deliberations,—the legislature may, indeed, *enact* the appropriation, and, in so doing, it will not step—(for it *cannot* step)—beyond the boundaries of its *abstract right*,—but it must expect that honest men will accuse it of stepping over that immoveable line which separates *moral* right from wrong, and just distribution from iniquitous spoliation. And this step, we may add, will be so much the more fearful, when the legislature has to deal with property which has once been dedicated to the service of God. Their task, in that case, becomes awful indeed. For they are, then, called upon to determine whether the cause of God will be advanced, or dishonoured, by their counsels; whether the progress of Divine Truth is likely to be aided or obstructed by their interference. And in what a spirit of humility and prayer, should a question of this magnitude be approached by human beings!

And now—to revert to the appropriating resolutions—let any dispassionate thinker ask himself,—where is the overwhelming *necessity* for the biting *ordinances*? Is the wealth of the Protestant Church of Ireland so extravagantly disproportionate to her wants as to justify such resolutions, in the sight of God or man? The revenues of that Church have been estimated with a most surprising freedom of hand. Some time ago, they amounted to no less than three *millions* annually! (probably, more than six times their actual sum.) They, then, gradually fell to one million. This million, again, sank down to 800,000*l.*; and nearly at this point, Lord John Russell takes his stand; his estimate being 791,000*l.* Lastly, comes Sir Robert Peel, who “positively asserts that so far is the Church, in Ireland, from having a clear “revenue of 791,000*l.*, that it has not 450,000*l.*!” Now, the numbers of the Irish Clergy, we believe, are not far from 1500. According to the estimate of Lord J. Russell, then, the whole revenue, if divided equally among them, man by man, would give to each an income of about 526*l.*,—according to Sir Robert Peel’s, of 300*l.*,—according to a medium estimate between the two, of 413*l.* Such would be the result, on the supposition of an absolute equality of income, among all the Protestant Ecclesiastics of Ireland. Such an equality, however, is purely chimerical. For the parochial Clergy, therefore, upon each of these scales, the estimate must be very considerably reduced, in order that more ample incomes may be allowed for the Prelates, and other dignified members of the Church. And now, we would ask, does even the highest of these estimates present us with any such enormity of wealth, as to call for the correcting hand of the legislature? Does a Church deserve the name of a “gorgeous “nuisance” because it could give an *average* income of some-

thing more than 500*l.* a year to each of its ministers; but considerably less than 500*l.* a year to its *parochial* ministers, if its revenue were distributed in the proportions demanded by the distinctions of rank and office?

But what is to be said, if the estimate of Sir R. Peel shall turn out to be the true one? Does there live the man, who really is anxious for the preservation of the establishment, and who yet will gravely aver that a curtailment of *superfluities* is needful for a church, which, on an equalizing division of its resources, could give no more than 300*l.* per annum to each individual of its clergy? Whether a more beneficial distribution of the existing revenue can be effected, or ought to be attempted, is a question totally distinct. The question now is, whether the annual sum of 450,000*l.* to be divided among 1500 men, and many of them family men, is a provision which demands reduction at the hand of a righteous and impartial government? What that revenue may become, in the course of time, and from change of circumstances, it is, of course impossible for any mortal to foresee. But for *us* to talk of a *surplus*, is to busy ourselves with a matter which *may*, perhaps, be fit for the consideration of our grandchildren; but with which *we* can have no more to do, than we have with the future produce of acres which, at this moment, bring forth nothing but thorns, or thistles, or ling, or whortle-berries.

Aye—but then we are reminded of the deserted churches—of the clergymen without congregations—of whole parishes which have nothing to do with the Protestant establishment, except to nourish it with a tenth (a tenth!) of their produce! And then we are asked—is it fit that the Church should labour any longer under the infamy of these sinecures? Is it not lawful and right that appropriation should lay her hand upon revenue which is now worse than useless, and turn it to some honest and profitable account! Can it be denied that these vacant incomes, at least, will form a *surplus*, with which the state may justly and legitimately deal! And to what purpose can this surplus be so properly applied, as to the general education of the people?

Here, we apprehend, lies the whole pith and marrow of the case of the appropriators. Here is the favorite spectacle in their show-box of grievances; at which they expect that all the friends of equity and fair-dealing will turn up their eyes, and lift up their hands. The uplifted hands and eyes, however, may probably come down again, after a little dispassionate consideration of the matter.

In the first place, then, it must be remembered, that the real issue to be tried is this: Is the *aggregate* revenue of the Irish Church, at this day, more than adequate to the *collective* neces-

sities of the Church? Let us, for a moment, suppose it to be true that there are certain districts, in which the cause of the Reformed Faith seems absolutely hopeless; and that the church income, arising from those districts, is placed at the disposal of the state. Are there no purposes, *strictly and properly ecclesiastical*, to which the state may usefully apply those vacant incomes? Are there no ruinous edifices to be repaired—no glebe-houses to be erected—no churches to be built—no starving preferments to be improved? Are there no exigencies of an ecclesiastical description, which are sufficient to swallow up whatever funds may possibly arise from the final abandonment of this or that parish to the undisturbed dominion of Romanism? Our own knowledge of details is far too imperfect to give any complete answer to these questions. But this we know, that until these questions are fully answered, it is—to say the very least—precipitate and premature, to talk of a *residuum*, applicable to purposes which are not ecclesiastical, or ecclesiastical only by a violent and strained construction. We contend that not one particle of that *residuum* ought to be touched, until it shall be ascertained, beyond all doubt, that the Church can well do without it, and that the Church is, therefore, content to place it at the disposal of the legislature.

But, secondly, can it be unknown to the appropriators that this part of their scheme must fill many a Protestant heart with dejection and terror? Let us imagine ourselves forming a portion of a small remnant of Protestants, in the midst of a population of Romanists. If our number once sinks below fifty—(or whatever the *minimum* may be)—the Protestant Church is to be swept away from the parish for ever. For this blessed consummation the good *Catholics* are impatient; and a little terror, or a little outrage, may perhaps speedily accomplish it. Placards, and threatening notices, appear at every corner of the village. Every now and then, the rick, or the barn, or possibly the cottage, of a Protestant, is in flames. Or it may happen that the lifeless body of a Protestant, with marks of deadly violence upon it, is occasionally found by the way side, or close by a neighbouring hedge. The little Protestant community is haunted with incessant consternation. They begin to fly from the scene of constant peril and alarm. Their number falls below the prescribed amount. The *heretical* church is at an end; and the chapel is alone triumphant! Can any one who knows Ireland, or has read of Ireland, pretend to say, that this is an extravagant and fiercely-coloured picture of the dangers with which the appropriation-scheme may quickly surround many a small and helpless society of peaceable Christians? Is it not to be feared that the adoption of that

scheme will be the signal for the exhibition of such tragedies? And have our legislators and our statesmen hearts which yearn not to think upon these things?

There is a multitude of other thoughts which crowd in upon us, when the Irish Church is the theme. But we must dismiss them briefly. We could remind our readers that Ireland is the ground on which the first battles of the United Church will probably be fought,—that when the edifice of our neighbours is blazing, our own rafters cannot long be safe,—that when the possessions of the Church are assailed, the march of revolution may hold on, over their ruins, to the storming of all other property,—that the voice of the *Movement* has been heard to declare, by the mouth of the *Examiner*, that not the wealth, but the very existence, of the Established Church, is “the great national iniquity,”—that there is, among the Protestants of Ireland, a *fearful looking for* of national woe, and rumours of war even to extermination,—and, lastly, that the empire is threatened with dismemberment. All these are matters which might occupy us long and painfully. But we forbear. These, it might be thought, are inflammatory topics, and therefore not fit for us; or they are doubtful topics, from which human sagacity should abstain; and we are quite sure that they would be weary topics,—for the sounds of warning are perpetually in our ears. And yet we cannot hold it honest or faithful to stifle the feelings with which we hear of the stealthy but alarming pace with which the Church of Rome is said to be recovering her ground among us. Is it not true that the Papacy is at this moment stretching out the neck, with *earnest expectation*, towards the struggle between the Protestant Faith and the Catholic Faith, which is now supposed to be going forward in the British Empire? What shall we say to the language of those foreign journals, which are the organs of Jesuitry? Do they not claim one of the foremost ministers of our Protestant king as the champion of the Romish Church,* the Defender of the Faith against the established heresy of Ireland? And, can it be denied that Romish Chapels are rising, in formidable number, in many quarters of the kingdom, and that the proselyting spirit is gone

* The following is the language of the *Gazette de France*, May 20, 1835:—“Let us admire the marvellous ways by which Providence causes the nations of the earth to march towards the destiny reserved for them. It is one of the great lords of England, it is the son of the Duke of Bedford, whose annual income exceeds five millions of *francs*, (200,000*l.*) who becomes, to-day, the champion of the principles of Reform and Liberty, and who takes in hand the defence of Roman Catholicism against the monstrous establishment of Protestantism in Ireland. And it is Sir Robert Peel, the son of a mere manufacturer, who is called upon by the proud British aristocracy, and by the disdainful English clergy, to come to the assistance of their menaced privileges, and of all their abuses, which, on all hands, appear to be on the point of falling into ruin.”—See *St. James's Chronicle*, Saturday, May 25, 1835.

forth boldly, more like the noon-day plague, than the dæmon that walketh in darkness? These things—if they prove nothing else—seem to establish, that a new life has been breathed into the carcase of Popery. Its movements are not like the galvanic startings of a lifeless body. They surely indicate a return of conscious activity and power. And, if this be so, does it not become the men of the Church of England, whether lay or clerical, to be sober, and watchful, and alert, lest their re-animated foe should spring upon our Protestant institutions, and strive to bring them to the earth?

We shall conclude our observations by laying before our readers a document, which some of them may have already seen, but which we think that all must regard as a very eloquent sign of the times. The Roman Catholic Almanac—(which is published annually, under the Roman Catholic Archbishop, and a copy of which all the Roman Catholic Clergy are ordered to possess),—contains the following very significant questions:—

“ Quomodo acquiritur dominium rei, jam dominum habentis?—Quid est titulus?—Quid est traditio?—Quid est prescriptio?—Quæ sunt legitimæ conditiones?—Quæ (conditio) bonæ fidei adversatur?—Quantum temporis ad complendam prescriptionem requiritur?—Prescriptio, anne transferat dominium, in Conscientiæ foro?”*

To the above, we shall add one or two questions of our own:—would not the Roman Catholic tithes and acres, which for three centuries have been in the hands of *heretics*, furnish a fine subject, for illustration, to a student at Maynooth, who might be required to exercise his acuteness and research upon the heads of *title, prescription, and legitimate conditions of ownership*?—Can it be at all an ambiguous matter, that these very tithes and acres were distinctly in the thoughts of the venerable personages who framed and propounded the above very ingenious questions?—Can it be disputed that the appropriating resolutions of the Imperial Parliament, will marvellously quicken the sagacity of the individuals, who may employ themselves upon the solution of those questions?—Lastly, can it be doubted that the *heretics*, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, must promptly and resolutely bestir themselves, unless they are content to see the tithes and acres revert to the possession of the *Mother and Mistress of all the Churches*?

Since the above was written, a rumour has been in circulation, that the appropriation clause is to be introduced into the pro-

* See the *Times*, May 18, 1835.

jected Tithe-Act, in such a form, as shall give to the measure the character of a *Money-Bill*; in order to compel the House of Peers to adopt, or to reject, the whole together. We can scarcely believe this. In the first place, it is extremely difficult to comprehend by what contrivance it would be effected. A money bill, if we rightly understand its nature, is an Act, by virtue of which, tax, or toll, or assessment of any kind, may be levied upon his majesty's subjects. And we are at a loss to perceive how an act for diverting from its original purposes a certain portion of property held in trust, or under conditions, can be made to fall under that description. If it could, the consequences would be somewhat startling. The precedent would go near to place all trust property whatever, not merely at the mercy of the legislature, but at the mercy of the House of Commons. The charitable settlements of the good Lady Hewley would be quite as destitute of protection, as the revenues of an Established Church. We are quite aware that the learned practitioners, usually employed in the manufacture of Acts of Parliament, have *verba et voces* at their command, which can frequently accomplish great marvels. But this is a masterpiece of conjuring which might seem to defy even their command of the wonder-working technical vocabulary. At any rate, we should greatly desire to have the opinion of his majesty's judges on the subject. But whether the *artists* can do the trick, or not,—the report sounds to our ears very much like a libel on his majesty's government. The design is altogether so sneaking, so pitiful, so utterly mean and cowardly, that, if it were to succeed, the title of the *thimble-rig* Parliament would be as immortal, as the title of the *lack-learning* Parliament. We should, therefore, be extremely sorry to give credence to any surmise which ascribes such a design to the ministers of the king. It must, surely, be "a weak invention of their enemies."

ART. VI.—1. *The Causes of the Corruption of Christianity.*

By the Rev. Robert Vaughan, Professor of Ancient and Modern History in the University of London. Jackson and Walford. 1834.

2. *Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical and Early Fathers.* By William Osburn, Jun. Hamilton and Adams. 1835.

On these two works the object is very much the same, namely, to prove that the stream of Christianity, so soon as it passed through

the heavenly soil of inspiration, contracted numerous impurities, many of which continue to tinge and pollute its waters even at the present day. They are both written with considerable ability and no small show of research; the authors are evidently serious men, who wish well to the cause of evangelical truth; and if their books have a practical tendency in any degree at variance with their benevolent motives, we are bound to ascribe the unhappy result either to the nature of the subject which they have undertaken to handle, or the unfavourable medium through which they have viewed it, but by no means to sinister intentions in their plan or purpose.

In entering upon such an inquiry, it naturally occurs, as a very important preliminary, to determine the standard of corruption; or, in other words, to fix upon some essential doctrines and indisputable usages, by a reference to which the soundness of all others may be ascertained. To illustrate what is here stated, it will be sufficient to call to the recollection of the reader a work by Dr. Priestley, the title of which bears a striking resemblance to that of Mr. Vaughan. According to that ingenious but eccentric writer, every thing in the Christian system was corrupt which did not symbolize with his scanty creed; and among the proofs that the followers of the Redeemer, in our times, have grievously erred from the path of pure belief, he alleged the tenets of the miraculous conception, the atonement, and the trinity. On the same ground it might be presumed, that a minister of the Congregationalist persuasion would denounce as the inventions of men nearly all the peculiarities of the Church of England, and more especially the rites which are associated with her constitution as an Episcopal communion. In the eye of such an author the presbyterian form of ecclesiastical polity must be equally corrupt with that which has been adopted, or retained, by the Greek Christians, the Roman, the Lutheran, and the reformed Episcopalian; and, consequently, the extent to which the institutions of the Gospel have been debased in these latter days must be regarded as beyond all calculation.

But, before we attempt to establish any criterion for sound doctrine and an authoritative ritual, we shall advert to those sources of error to which Christianity was exposed in the first stages of its progress, and of which the effects may be still partially traced in certain theological hypotheses which from time to time seem to come into favour.

As the doctrines of the Gospel were not propounded in a regular form, nor derived by any determinate process of reasoning from a set of first principles philosophically established, most of the early converts, whether from Judaism or the religion of the

Heathen, endeavoured to engraft them upon the several systems in which they had originally reposed their belief. The efforts made by the Jews for this purpose are familiar to every reader of the New Testament. Convinced of the perpetuity of their own law, they lent a very reluctant ear to the declarations and arguments of the Apostles relative to its entire abolition, viewed as an economy of outward ordinances. Many of them, accordingly, were willing to receive the truths revealed by Jesus, but could not be induced to relinquish the observances instituted by Moses. We are assured, in fact, by the Sacred historian, to whom we owe the Book of Acts, that from the beginning there were thousands of Jews who believed, and that all were zealous of the law. We learn also from the language of Justin Martyr, that in his time there continued to be a large class of Hebrew characters who were properly the successors of those earlier converts; men whom he viewed as holding the same faith with himself, and as heirs, notwithstanding their adherence to Levitical usages, of the salvation which he also hoped to attain. Proceeding on this broad ground, they saw no impropriety in circumcising their children and also baptizing them; in having recourse to the purifications of the Temple and to the sacraments of the Church; in commemorating the passover together with the more stupendous event of the Saviour's resurrection; in looking for the restoration of Israel to sovereign power on the throne of David, and likewise for that glorious renewal of human nature which will be brought to pass at the latter day, by the mighty working of Him who is able to subdue all things unto himself.

It is obvious that such an amalgamation could not fail to prove dangerous to the pure belief of Christianity, and that the disciple of Moses, in many instances, must have proved a treacherous ally to the companions of the Apostles. So deceitful indeed was the snare thereby presented, that even the immediate servants of the Redeemer did not always successfully avoid it. Compelled by circumstances to act to some extent on the principle of expediency, and influenced by the benevolent desire to gain their erring brethren to a better faith, those renowned Missionaries of the Son of God, St. Peter and St. Paul, proceeded further in the way of concession than either of them could approve in the case of the other. Nor did this necessity diminish immediately upon the formation of the infant Churches in Palestine and Asia Minor, the members of which were principally of Jewish extraction, and still fondly attached to their ancient ceremonies. If the attainment of a higher object justified, in the estimation of an inspired teacher, the sacrifice of an inferior one; if Timothy was circumcised to remove a stumbling-block from the path of Hebrew

proselytes; and if the great Apostle of the Gentiles put himself to charges in the temple of Jerusalem, that he might calm the jealousy of the more bigoted among his countrymen, it will not appear surprising, should we discover that less prudent guides connived at a closer approximation of the two systems of religious obligation, both issuing from a divine fountain, and both enforced by a spiritual sanction. The new wine, in short, was too hastily put into the old bottles; and, in not a few instances, the bottles were broken and the wine was spilled: the new cloth was put upon the old garment, and in numerous cases the rent was made worse.

Every one who has perused with attention the Apostolical Epistles must have observed the excessive and unreasonable attachment of the Jews to their ancient law. It must be obvious also, as Mr. Vaughan remarks, that the causes which produced this state of mind with regard to the ritual part of Moses' institution, were precisely those which tended to veil the true doctrine of the Jewish lawgiver from the men professing to be his disciples. Hence there was the greatest reason to fear, that an obstinate adherence to the more imposing ceremonies of the law would prove a source of corruption to the simple institutions of the Gospel. There was the same room for apprehension lest the misconception which had so long prevailed as to the general design of the legal economy, should be found no less injurious to the purity of the Christian doctrine. As the Mosaical dispensation was avowedly of a temporary nature, "the shadow of good things to come," no one could assert the tenet of its perpetual obligation, without betraying his ignorance as to the distinct character and the real object of the two economies. Hence, too, the connexion of the disputes, which at an early period divided the Church, on the permanent claims of the law, as opposed to the evangelical views of justification held forth by the Apostles. Thus, error was propagated throughout a large and very influential class of persons, from the operation of motives which were in themselves praiseworthy; the belief in Christ being rendered void, by an undue and uncompromising zeal for Moses.

The heresies which alarmed the later portion of the apostolical age had their origin in the misapprehensions now stated. The absurdities of Cerinthus and the blasphemous pretensions of Simon the magician, may be distinctly referred to this source; a blind reverence for the institution established in the Wilderness, mingled with a desire for initiation into the sublimer mysteries of the Gospel. It is admitted that the former of these heretics was a Jew, and that he encouraged an observance of the Mosaic ceremonies among his followers. It also appears that, from a wrong

reading or interpretation of a passage in Deuteronomy, he regarded the world as created by angels, and not by the Almighty; that he distinguished himself as a preacher of the millennium, holding out, among the rewards to be obtained by his disciples, a state of physical existence and enjoyment on the earth during a thousand years; and that he represented Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary in the ordinary course of nature and no more, adding that an emanation from the Deity, to which the name of Christ was exclusively appropriated, descended on him at his baptism, and remained with him till a little before his crucifixion. According to this hypothesis, our Saviour was a mere man, and only raised somewhat above the level of our frailties by being made a more special temple for that divine energy which worked in the created spirit "to will and to do."

The Ebionites, too, were a scion from the same bitter root, and corrupted Christianity by carrying into it certain debased notions of their former creed. They are said to have been divided into two classes; but the only difference which can now be ascertained, is, that while the one admitted the miraculous conception of our Lord, the other rejected it. There is reason to believe that the only documents received by them, as of strict religious authority, were the Pentateuch and the Gospel according to St. Matthew; and that both of these were considerably mutilated. Above all things, this invincible attachment to the law taught them to abhor the pretensions of St. Paul, and even to assail his character with the grossest calumnies.

"From the notices which have descended to us with regard to the whole of these sects, it is evident," says Mr. Vaughan, "that the causes which produced the grossest corruptions of revealed truth among the Jews before the Advent were in operation with that people, and with similar effect, subsequent to that event. By the daring impiety of these persons, especially of the Ebionites, all the distinguishing doctrines of holy writ were more or less discarded; and the scattered fragments of truth that were retained, were subject to admixtures of error in the greatest degree repugnant to them. If true believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, did not become corrupters of the Christian doctrine, even to the utmost, it was not because the times were too pure to have supplied the stimulus of example in such a course of proceeding. We have not the means of tracing the effect of the Ebionite creed on the faith of the heretical sects belonging to the first three centuries; but we may conclude that in the multiplied productions of those disputants, which history informs us were once widely circulated, frequent appeal was made to the degree of sanction conferred on every speculative extravagance, by the doctrine of a class of persons, who were the natural descendants of Abraham and professors of Christianity.—It would not be difficult to show, that Arianism owed its origin in no small measure to Judaism as expounded by the

Alexandrian Jews, and especially by their great representative, Philo. The mystical and elaborate effusions of that writer on the character of the Logos, were so far contradictory, that those regarding the Word as a person, or as a mere attribute—as a created, or an uncreated nature—might have appealed to the authority of that great Hebrew Platonist with nearly equal confidence.”

The next order of men who laboured to systematize Christianity on a basis already acknowledged, were the disciples of the School of Manes, whose dogmas, originating in some one of the Persian provinces, at length found acceptance among the wise men of Babylon and the Rabbis of Judea. The subtle, but wild speculations of the Gentiles, bore a close resemblance and a near relationship to the oriental dreams with which the fallen Hebrews became familiar in the land of their captivity. For this reason it is not easy, in some cases, to draw an intelligible line between the heresies which sprung from Jewish teachers in the apostolical age, and those which, by their peculiar tendency, claim a more decided connexion with the seats of Eastern philosophy. In the hands of Zoroaster, the conclusions of more ancient masters were moulded into such a form as to convey as the leading doctrine of his system, that the present world derived its existence from two causes or principles, the one good and the other evil; rival powers which were also regarded as the governors of this portion of the Universe, and the directors of the mixed order of events so characteristic of the present condition of man. Hence the perpetual conflict between the two mighty antagonist energies of good and of evil would seem to divide the natural as well as the moral world. But besides these, the Oromasdes and the Arimanus of Persian theology, there were various spiritual natures which had emanated from the Supreme Existence, and which had their respective places assigned to them in that vast space which separates the Divine Presence from the local habitation of man. These subordinate Intelligences were supposed to show knowledge and enjoyment in proportion to their proximity to the fountain of light and happiness; while matter, being removed to a vast distance from the Divine effulgence, becomes dark, inert, and sluggish, unvisited by every intellectual energy, and a stranger to all the emotions which agitate or delight the sentient and reflecting parts of Creation.

Viewed in connection with Christianity, there is a peculiarity in the oriental philosophy which deserves attention, namely, the theocratic spirit by which it was animated. The nations of the East, it has been remarked, have had various opinions as to the origin and purpose of religious institutions; but they have always agreed in regarding theology as their parent science. Not only

their jurisprudence, but even the most abstract departments of their knowledge, were taught either as parts of their religion, or as matters which were to be pursued in subjection to its dictates and subserviency to its interests. According to the tenets which were most widely received amongst them, the Eternal Principle was everything and man nothing. It is from their conceptions of this principle that all their knowledge has its complexion and its appropriation—exhibiting the experience and actions of men, and even man himself, as no more than parts of one varied mode of subsistence, which we call *nature*, and which is, in fact, the ever-changing manifestation of an ever-moving energy, assigning existence or decay, without cessation and with equal indifference, to the inert and the animate, insects and men. It is true that the spirit of theocracy which disclosed itself by slow degrees in ecclesiastical history, was not founded on a theology in all respects of this terrible and mysterious description; but the degree in which this tendency of orientalism affected a large mass of persons, and many great names, among the Christians of the first four centuries, did much to prepare the way for that reign of the *priest-caste* by which Christendom was so long enslaved. Every one must perceive that the tendency of oriental philosophy, whether viewed in its earlier stages, or in its later forms of Gnosticism and Manichism, was to induce a disposition to luxuriate rather than to act; to endure rather than to dare. Submission was its great law. Hence its invariable alliance with civil despotism; and to the same cause we must, in a great degree, ascribe the marvellous fixedness of its character. Its principles and effects, in the age of Alexander, were precisely those which distinguish it through the eastern world at this day.

The science of Greece and Rome was neither more wise in its objects, nor more salutary in its consequences. The Epicureans, Stoics, Academics, and Peripatetics, borrowed most of their notions from the East or from Egypt, whither Pythagoras, the father of their philosophy, had repaired at an early period. All of them may be said to have admitted the existence of a divine power, while they denied its exercise in the direction of human affairs; regarding the world as produced by a cause equally void of intention as to the main result, and of care as to the issue. Professing themselves to be wise they became foolish; and adopting as the practical rule of life a mixture of atheism and licentiousness, they exclaimed, “let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.”

Such extravagant notions, it is granted, could not affect Christianity, because the principles of the two systems had nothing in common, and could not possibly be mistaken for each other. It required a purer and more lofty hypothesis to deceive the disciple

of Christ, and to lead him gradually to acknowledge the belief that the wisdom of this world might in some cases be employed to illustrate or recommend the wisdom of God. For this purpose the subtle speculations of Plato proved much more efficacious than the self-indulgent doctrines of Epicurus; and those, who would have rejected the luxurious indolence of the one school, were captivated by the appearance of refinement and profound disquisition which distinguished the other. In the reasonings or conjectures of the Academy, the Parent of the Universe was always venerated as the moral governor of his creatures, and as possessing a nature separate from matter in all its forms. From his purely spiritual existence, the souls of men were supposed to proceed, and to share in the immortality which belonged to the source whence they sprang; a basis being thereby obtained for the important tenet of future reward and punishment, and for a code of morals better suited than any before it to the rational nature of the human being and the purposes of society. But the dreams of Plato were not always so exalted, nor even free from pernicious errors. Not to mention his frequent assumption of things without proof, he often expresses himself in a manner extremely enigmatical; ascribing to the power which he praises as the architect of the world, neither infinitude, immensity, omnipresence, nor omniscience; but imagining him to be confined within certain limits, and to have committed the government of the world to a number of inferior intelligences. What he teaches concerning these demons or ministering spirits, and concerning the origin and condition of the human soul, tends very strongly to produce superstition, and to confirm men in the worship of subordinate divinities. The mind, while connected with the body, he viewed as a prison, and inculcated that its escape from this thralldom, and its restoration to its proper state of alliance with the divine nature, could only be accomplished by means of contemplation. The effect of this doctrine on the minds of the weak and the speculative was to produce a neglect of the body, and of the ordinary concerns of life, and a disposition to abandon themselves to the feignings of the imagination.*

It is obvious that there is much orientalism in the philosophy of Plato; that it was, in fact, a mere adaptation of the Persian creed to the habits and wishes of a more western people; and, moreover, that it supplied the foundation or the apology for those monkish reveries and unsocial propensities which mark the early history of the Christian Faith in Egypt and the parts about Cyrene. The school of Alexandria, where platonism was revived under

* Mosh. *De Rebus ante Constantinum*, cap. i. sect. 29, quoted by Mr. Vaughan.

the auspices of men who believed in Moses, and who were not unwilling to engraft upon the tenets of their two masters the leading doctrines of Jesus Christ, may be regarded as the stronghold whence Gnosticism drew its most efficient armour. This extravagant theory, so intimately connected with the rise of the Gospel in certain provinces of the Roman Empire, is distinguished from the oriental doctrines, properly so called, by its freer reception of the fanciful notions of Plato, its more visionary details with regard to celestial natures, and by the extent to which it is indebted to the evangelical narratives for articles of belief. The Christian Gnostics, as every one knows, taught not only the existence of the two great principles of good and evil, but also the sundry gradations of inferior agents issuing as it were from the Divine nature: and they even allowed themselves to speak of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, and of the Church, as belonging to this order of spiritual Eons. They also held that our Saviour, as the instrument of the Supreme Deity, became visible on earth, that he might remedy the evil inflicted on the souls of men by the Demiurgus, or lord of matter and maker of the world, and procure to them a deliverance from this present connexion with the body, and the gift of perfection in divine knowledge, which, it was supposed, must necessarily embrace all other perfection. Distinguished by their practice of ascribing so high a value to mere knowledge, and by the assumption that they themselves were in the only path which could lead to it, they obtained the appellation of Gnostics, the "knowing, or the enlightened."

It may be enough to have indicated in this brief manner the sources of corruption, with which the pure stream of Christianity was doomed to mix almost as soon as it issued from the fountains of inspiration. The treasure of divine truth has all along been committed to "earthen vessels," and it has more or less derived a flavour, as well from the substance of which those vessels were composed, as from the nature of the ingredients with which they were originally filled. The Gospel was at first viewed through different mediums, according to the position in which it was presented, not less than according to the ground on which the spectator was situated. If accustomed to examine the dispensations of the heavenly grace from the heights of Mount Sinai, he could not see the Gospel but as it were through a glass darkly, and even with a veil on his eyes. The whole system would assume a Levitical aspect; a mere modification of his ancient rites and ordinances; an adaptation of Judaism to a philosophical age. If, again, he was invited to contemplate it from the high places of profane science, the cosmogonies and theocracies of the heathen schools, he would find his imagination caught by resemblances

between the new faith and the speculations of his favourite sages; and whatever in this respect might seem wanting, he would labour to supply.

In this way, there can be no doubt, the religion taught by the Apostles savoured differently in different individuals, according to their former tastes and pursuits. Even in their own case, the mode of illustration,—the benevolent device by which they laboured to bring the prejudiced soul to the perception of eternal truth,—was varied agreeably to circumstances; and thus it will be found that St. Paul fashioned his discourses so as to meet the comprehension of his hearers, to assuage the resentment of their zeal, to comply with their modes of thinking, and to secure at least a favourable hearing. His harangue to the incensed crowd in Jerusalem differed not more from his discourse on Mars'-hill at Athens, than the latter did from his fine appeal to King Agrippa, when seated at the tribunal of Festus. No one can read the Epistles of this eminent servant of the Redeemer without perceiving numerous proofs that he had studied at the feet of Gamaliel, and also made himself somewhat acquainted with the writings of pagan authors. In his person the "earthen vessel" was different from what it was in St. John or St. Peter, though the "excellency of the power" was in all cases the same.

In like manner, when perusing the works of the Christian Fathers, it is easy to discover, in what sect they had been educated, what school they had acknowledged, and what master they had followed, before they took up the cross. The style of argument, the references, the allusions, the figures, and the general tone of the declamation, point out the nation whence the particular individual derived his birth, and the studies to which his youth had been devoted. Philosophy, which ought to be the handmaid of revealed religion, has sometimes so far taken the precedence of her mistress, as to have entirely usurped her place. Of this fact we have still a striking example in the fundamental doctrines of Calvinism, which are not, in reality, founded on the basis of the New Testament, but on the conclusions of the ancient Stoics respecting fate and the necessary concatenation of events. When studying this subject, Augustine read not in the Gospels, nor studied the laws of Christianity as expounded by the Redeemer; he chose rather to draw his learning from the treatises of the Manichæan doctors, who, in order to avoid the difficulties which respect the existence of evil, resolved all the phenomena of the moral world into the councils of the Deity and the necessity of human action. His ignorance of Greek disqualified him from propounding the Scriptures; and the same defect rendered it necessary that he should read even his favourite Platonists in a Latin

version. Calvin himself, at least when he wrote his *Institutions*, could not boast of higher attainments in the original language of the Christian covenant; and, accordingly, being unable to appreciate the import of the several expressions used by St. Paul when describing the election of the sons of Abraham, he has, like his predecessor of Hippo Regius, assigned to them a meaning which, from other parts of his writings, it is manifest the inspired author meant not to convey. These two great writers viewed the Gospel through a medium which belonged to a different age, and upon principles which had supported a very different system; but having, from a concurrence of circumstances, acquired a certain influence in their respective generations, they succeeded in impressing upon the religion of Jesus Christ the repulsive aspect of the most hated of ancient heresies.

Meanwhile, it is worthy of remark, that, though our faith was endangered by the accession of unseemly concomitants, its essential principles were not called in question. In many cases, the earthen vessels were impure, but the precious treasure was neither diminished nor materially soiled. The attempt to reconcile pagan doctrines with the precepts of Christ, and to find in the usages of the Gentiles a counterpart to the sacred observances of the Church, led, no doubt, to much extravagance as well as to the most contemptible reasoning. But the most accommodating of the Fathers, while they had the good nature to discover proofs of divine inspiration in the volumes of Plato, and tokens of heavenly origin in the festivals of the heathen gods, did not relinquish any tenet of their own purer belief. They betrayed want of taste, and on some occasions, perhaps, want of knowledge; but they cannot be charged with any infirmity of resolution, any defect of honesty or of zeal.

For example: in the course of his *Apology* to the Emperor Antoninus, the venerable Justin Martyr defends the practice of calling our Redeemer the Son of God, by observing, that "such language should not be deemed strange by men who were wont to speak of Jupiter having sons, and especially of Mercury, as being his interpreter and the instructor of the human race." Again he remarks, "if Christ be a mere man, yet he deserves to be called the Son of God on account of his wisdom, the ancients describing their Jupiter as the father of gods and men; and if in an extraordinary manner he be the Logos of God, this is in common with those who call Mercury the logos, because he declares the will of God."

Now although every one must question the propriety of such an argument on such an occasion, the candid reader will nevertheless hold himself ready to defend the sincere and ardent apolo-

gist from the remotest impeachment of treachery to the cause which he had so nobly espoused. His life and his death afford the most satisfactory evidence that he valued the truth as a pearl of great price, and that no earthly consideration could induce him to part with it. Hence we may conclude that he regarded the style of reasoning which he adopted as more likely than any other to make a favourable impression on the mind of the Emperor, and to disarm his prejudices against the religion of the Nazarenes. He thought himself justified in having recourse to the *argumentum ad hominem*, being countenanced in this proceeding by an example, of which the authority could not be questioned by any follower of the Redeemer. When the Jews took up stones to cast at the Lord Jesus, he said, "Many good works have I showed you from my Father, for which of these works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, for a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?"

It cannot be imagined that the Saviour relinquished his claim to be esteemed the Son of God in a peculiar and special sense, merely because he argued with the Jews on the more general ground assumed by him for the occasion, and referred to an application of the offensive terms in a case which they could not condemn without "breaking their own Scripture." This species of condescension, when employed to convince a weak mind, or to blunt the edge of a violent prejudice, is at once perfectly consistent with honesty towards the gainsayer, and with a firm adherence to the doctrine, the maintenance of which seems for the moment to be compromised. On this point Mr. Vaughan, who sometimes sees corruption in similar acts of expediency, defends the conduct of Justin.

"When," says he, "the principle on which an obnoxious doctrine is founded is admitted by the opponents of that doctrine, there is not necessarily any abandonment of that principle in the method of reminding such opponents of their inconsistency in this particular, which our apologist chose to adopt. Nothing, as every one knows, is more common or more legitimate than this manner of reasoning. The object of Justin, in the passages adduced, was simply to show that, whatever might be his real doctrine, the parties objecting to the language he had employed, were condemned out of their own mouth. Similar passages are continually quoted from the Fathers, as betraying a disposition to corrupt the truths of our religion in the hope of procuring it a more general ac-

ceptance. That there were instances in which a compromise of this injurious nature occurred is not denied; but even in these cases it is far from being in our power to determine the amount of culpable motive that may have been in exercise; and it must ever be incumbent upon us to distinguish between excesses and a laudable attempt to render the acknowledged principles of mankind subservient to the peculiar claims of Christianity."

It is further admitted, that, when the Fathers appeal to certain pre-conceived notions of mankind as being in accordance with the leading facts of our holy religion, they do not mean to rest the claims of divine truth on the strength of such resemblances. Besides, it ought to be remembered that those early writers did not allow the merit of such coincidences or similarities to the unaided genius of pagan philosophy; but boldly claimed for a holier inspiration all the lofty ideas and sound precepts which were to be found scattered in the volumes of the Academy or the Porch. Indeed, they hesitated not to assert that the riches of intellect and wisdom, so much admired in the disquisitions of Plato, were drawn from the books of Moses and the Prophets; while it was insinuated that, on some occasions, the Ethnic science, where it most resembled the Bible, arose from the suggestion of the Evil One, who, by introducing a false gospel, cherished the hope that he might entirely defeat the great design of Christianity. It is not necessary to add, that, by challenging for Revelation more than really belonged to it, they did no small injury to the cause of sound criticism and evangelical truth. In following out this favourite view, it became necessary that every thing deemed reasonable in the systems of pagan wisdom should, by some means or other, be detected in the sacred oracles; and, in making these discoveries, the boldest and most unjustifiable methods of expounding the Old Testament were brought into very common use. Of the fantastic mode of interpreting Scripture, to which the notion now mentioned gave birth, an instance occurs in the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus. One of his maxims was, that the study of philosophy should not only accompany the study of divinity, but even precede it; and in one instance an appeal is made to a passage in the Pentateuch in support of this opinion.

"In the account of Sarah and Agar he finds every thing necessary for his purpose. In Abraham he saw the representative of a divinely taught believer in the Gospel; in Sarah the emblem of Christian wisdom or divinity; and in Agar the personification of human wisdom or philosophy. Abraham lived long in a wedded state with Sarah, but remained childless—a circumstance which was meant to teach that the mind, to become fruitful, must not be conversant with Christian wisdom or divinity alone. The history which states that Abraham afterwards took Agar to himself, with the consent of Sarah, is explained as teaching that men may teach

pagan philosophy with the full consent of Christian theology. The birth of Isaac by Sarah was subsequent to the birth of Ishmael by Agar, and this fact is said to show that the men who give their attention to profane as well as sacred studies, are alone capable of becoming spiritual fathers in the church, their efforts as philosophers being necessary to their success as divines."

Such a fanciful scheme of exposition could not fail to produce much trifling, and perhaps to lead to some extravagant conclusions. But the great doctrines of Christianity, nevertheless, remained sound and unassailed. The literature of those early times was heady, imaginative, and even puerile, and, so far, its alliance with religion cannot confer upon the latter either strength or reputation. But it was at once free from all scepticism, and bound by the most dutiful feelings to the authority of the Apostles; and therefore, though it might occasionally caricature and distort the most solemn subjects, it never attempted to undermine the foundations of orthodoxy. It treated Christianity, as the Roman Catholics in some countries treat the memory of its divine author, lavishing ornament and eulogy without either taste or discrimination, and thereby exciting a smile when their intentions were most serious. The compositions of certain ancient believers are like the silk and tinsel, in which the Virgin Mary is adorned, when exhibited for special adoration, in the churches of Italy and Spain. The semblance of the holy Mother may be correct, and the feelings revived by the effigy may be pious, and the effect, on the whole, may not be unfavourable to unenlightened devotion; but every eye accustomed to better things must bewail the rouge and the gilding, the gaudy feathers and the harlequin robes. In this case, however, as in that of the early writers, the great facts are preserved, though somewhat disfigured. The doctrine of the incarnation is venerated, the Redeemer's humiliation is kept in remembrance, and there is light thrown on the fundamental tenet of the Gospel, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent. We defend not the fanciful and absurd expositions of Justin, of Clement, of Origen, and their imitators; on the contrary, viewed either as specimens of theological scholarship, or as attempts to elucidate the darker portions of the Divine record, we readily acknowledge that, while in these respects the most successful of their efforts deserve little praise, some of their extravagances might justify a severe censure. In their behalf we maintain nothing more than that they did not abandon nor betray the essential articles of the creed which was confided to their keeping by the apostles or the successors of the apostles; and that, though they sometimes laboured to adorn the fine gold and to give brilliancy

to the diamond, they did not change the precious ore, nor sacrifice the splendid mineral.

It may be also admitted that the fathers of the second and third centuries were not free from the angry style and intemperate declamation which characterized their age. The orators and authors of those times thought themselves privileged to use a freedom of remonstrance and invective, from which even the most popular of our rhetoricians would deem it necessary to abstain. Mr. Vaughan justly remarks, that, though the want of delicacy, ingenuousness, and even of common integrity, so frequently observable in the controversies of our day, is sufficiently appalling, yet in this respect the moderns are entitled to the praise of moderation and virtue, if compared with the ancients. With our conception of a philosopher, we associate calmness and dignified deliberation; and may therefore be much surprised to learn that the discussions of such men were exercises in which they gave vent to the most vulgar slander and abuse, clothed for the most part in the language of educated men, but uttered with a violence hardly distinguishable from that of a Python. There was nothing in the refinement of either Athens or Rome, to secure the public against the frequent exhibition of such scenes. The art of reviling as with the force of a torrent, and without any nice regard to the true or the probable, was one of the most essential requisites in a rising orator, whether in the senate or at the bar. Lucian paints the disputing philosophers of his day, as wiping the perspiration from their brows with a bent finger, while uttering their vociferations, and as separating after having done little more than abuse each other to the utmost.

We could scarcely expect to find the advocates of Christianity, when descending into the arena of dispute, to differ much from their contemporaries in the manner of conducting an argument; and it cannot be denied that, in the ardour of their zeal, they occasionally gave an undue licence to their tongues, as well as to their imaginations. It is mentioned as an extenuation of this national vice, that many of them, before they embraced the new faith, were orators and teachers of rhetoric by profession, and had accordingly been equally familiar with the debates of the schools and the strife of the bar. Such were Tertullian, Cyprian, Menucius Felix, Lactantius, Arnobius, Victorinus and Augustine. The passions of Tertullian sometimes led him to indulge in a vehemence of abuse which no circumstances could warrant; but which, if we except the diatribes of Jerome, is of rare occurrence in any other of the early Christian writers. An almost ludicrous illustration of this remark, applicable to the

African divine, occurs in the commencement of his work against Marcion.

"This person was a Gnostic and a great corrupter of Christianity; but nevertheless a man of learning and the advocate of maxims which procured his followers the reproach among their countrymen of being Christians. That the reader might be prejudiced as much as possible against the heresy of Marcion, Tertullian indulges in the most elaborate abuse of the native country of that heresiarch. The 'Pontus Euxinus' is described as the most inhospitable of regions, its inhabitants as roaming about in moveable cabins, the sexes as indulging in the most promiscuous intercourse, and both as accustomed to wield the battle-axe in war, and to feast on human flesh. The very elements are made to partake of a strange and ominous character. There are no winds except from the north, no seasons that do not belong to winter. The rivers consist of ice, the mountains of snow, and the heavens are blackness. The cold and the lifeless are every where, nothing being warm, nothing living except what is atrocious. But the greatest reproach of Pontus is, that it should have given birth to Marcion, more ferocious than a Scythian, more unsettled than the homeless savage, more inhuman than the Massagetæ, more daring than the Amazon, more gloomy than the clouds, more cold than winter, more brittle than ice, more deceptive than the Danube, more fitted to inflict sudden destruction than Caucasus!"

Such railing could confer no credit upon any cause, and would not be severely felt by the most sensitive antagonist. It bears a greater resemblance to a school exercise—a rhetorical display of words—than to a serious defence of an evangelical doctrine. But, it must be added, that such perversion of language was not confined to the days of Tertullian. The era of the Reformation, when the ardour and keenness of ancient times were for a season revived, witnessed a renewal of similar abuse, and saw the whole vocabulary of invective employed once more by writers who, in eloquence and boldness, were equal to the most distinguished of the primitive ages. In wielding the armour of theological resentment, Luther proved himself a match for the best practised of his opponents; and Calvin, when he found it necessary to take the field, showed that he could call forth the thunder from the dark clouds of his professional wrath to smite the proudest of his enemies. The reproaches directed against Castellio are not less bitter than those heaped on Marcion by his able foe.

It will not, indeed, be denied that, as to the manner of illustrating Christian doctrines and of entering into their defence, there might be a considerable resemblance in the plan pursued by the learned persons we have just named, to that which they

had been accustomed to follow before they became members of the Church. In their mode of writing a dissertation, or conducting an argument, they, no doubt, felt the spirit of the times in which they lived; and were probably no less intemperate in attacking the institutions of paganism, than they had shown themselves when supporting its authority as the religion of their fathers.

The war of controversy was not terminated, until the great body of believers agreed to have certain compends of doctrine, exhibiting, in a condensed form, the result of their inquiries into holy writ; and affording, in all cases, an easy reference to those of their number who were willing to direct their path by the aid of such light. Mr. Vaughan, for reasons which do not appear satisfactory, does not hesitate to condemn what he calls "those scholastic abridgements of Christianity," which, under the name of creeds or canons, superseded the Scriptures, conferred an undue authority on the ministers of religion, and, as he farther maintains, contributed to the manifest deterioration of every thing Christian. He ascribes, it is true, the establishment of this "false authority" in the Church to the influence of the ancient philosophy; but, in our opinion, he fails to trace this alleged connexion between the tenets or usages of any of the Grecian sages, and the introduction of doctrinal symbols, or confessions of faith, into the worship and standards of the visible body of the Redeemer. It is neither wise nor candid to denounce creeds as one of the pagan corruptions of the Gospel. As time passed on, a certain weight would naturally be ascribed to the opinions of the Fathers and the decrees of Councils, as well-studied expositions of the sacred volume, if not as authoritative determinations of disputed points in theology. The earlier writers, after the lapse of two or three generations, would come to be regarded as witnesses to the truth, and as useful assistants for discovering the true meaning of Scripture; a result which, so far from being peculiarly heathenish, is perfectly in accordance with the dictates of practical wisdom in all forms of society.

But we can no longer conceal that the most objectionable thing in Mr. Vaughan's book, is his practice of attributing to "pagan influence" and "Gentile philosophy" every institution or observance in primitive times which he himself does not like, or which may not happen to be recognized by the communion to whose ministry he has devoted his exertions. Thus we find that the rite of Confirmation, Holy Orders, Episcopacy, and belief in the Middle State, are to be regarded as possessing no higher warrant than such as might be derived from that "false authority" which the pride and ambition of divines, guided by the wisdom of

this world, finally established in the church. The Christian doctrine that the soul of man exists between death and the resurrection in a condition separated from the body, is very ignorantly ascribed to a notion entertained by Plato. Does not every novice in theology, to whom the book of Genesis is not entirely unknown, discover proof of that very ancient opinion in the lamentation of Jacob over his son Joseph, whom he supposed to have been torn and devoured by a wild beast? Aware that his child could not be deposited in any grave, his resolution "to go down to him mourning" could not apply to the earthly remains; hence the *sheol*, where he hoped to re-join his beloved boy, could be no other than the place of departed spirits, the paradise of the Jews, and of the primitive believers in Christ. Similar views are expressed in several other parts of the Old Testament, and especially in the prophecies of Isaiah, relative to the state of the departed; a fact which ought to have prevented the author, now before us, from assigning a belief so old and universal to the imagination of a heathen philosopher.

It cannot occasion any surprize to find prelacy represented as a "human invention," springing from the corruptions of human nature and the fascinations of Gentile philosophy. As Mr. Vaughan believes in the divine legation of Moses, and in the authenticity of the writings which bear his name, he must perceive some reason to question the soundness of his own statement as to the origin of prelatical power in the church of God. Was not the polity of the Hebrews—that sacred institution described and enjoined by the voice of the Almighty—established on prelatical principles? Did not the Redeemer himself make a distinction between the two classes of ministers whom he employed in establishing upon earth what is emphatically called the kingdom of heaven; namely, the twelve Apostles and the seventy Disciples? Was not the Apostolical regimen prelatical? Did not these holy men claim and exercise authority over the persons whom they had appointed to sacred offices, and even convey to others the privilege of commanding and rebuking the elder or priest? It is mere trifling, by way of answer to such observations, to remark that there are no injunctions laid down in the New Testament for the direction of the Christian world in such matters, and, therefore, that ecclesiastical model and rule must either be regarded as possessing no importance in themselves, or as being left to the discretion of believers in different ages and nations. To perceive the fatuity of such reasoning, let it be remembered that the churches to whom the Apostles wrote were already formed and constituted according to the proper system; having in them bishops (or

presbyters) and deacons, and being under the superintendence of their inspired founders. It was not, therefore, necessary to delineate a plan of government which was already in operation; no more than it was necessary to enjoin the observance of the first day of the week as the day of Christian worship, or to leave directions for the baptism of infants. In all these cases the rule was found in the practice. If any opponent of Episcopacy, infant-baptism, or of the sacred obligation of keeping the Lord's day, will point out a time, subsequently to the apostolical age, when these institutions *began* to be introduced among Christians, we will then listen to the assertion of Mr. Vaughan that prelacy is a human invention, originating in "false authority," and confirmed by the philosophy of the Gentiles. But the most subtle and shrewd among the enemies of the church cannot find a beginning for episcopacy later in its date than the times of the Apostles. The word bishop, indeed, underwent a change of meaning soon after the demise of those divinely-appointed governors of the faithful. It had been applied indiscriminately with the term presbyter to the second order of ministers; but, when the personal servants of the Lord were all removed from this world, the title of Apostle was laid aside, and that of bishop was thenceforth *exclusively* used with reference to the highest rank of ecclesiastical functionaries.

When a writer is heated with the fire of controversy, there are scarcely any limits to the hardness of his assertions; for which reason we are not, perhaps, to be astonished when we read in Mr. Vaughan's book that "under the Tudor dynasty of this kingdom it was generally agreed that the office and jurisdiction of the prelates were of purely human institution." Instead of replying to this bold statement in the words of history, a method of refutation which might prove a little tedious, we shall simply quote an authority which is in every body's hands, the Book of Common Prayer. In the Preface to the Ordinal, authorized by parliament and convocation, when a Tudor was on the throne, we are instructed as follows:—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

That the office of prelates is of human institution, says the Professor of History in the University of London, has been conceded long since by the most learned Episcopalians and the most devout Reformers in this country, and even by our houses of convocation and of parliament. Under Henry VIII., he adds, these were all parties in affirming that "in the New Testament there is no mention of any other degrees but of deacons or

ministers, and of presbyters or bishops :” and in declaring as the consequence, that every shade of official inequality in the pastors of the church had been introduced “ by the laws of men, and not by any ordinance of God.”

To establish this rather staggering account of the opinions held by the most learned Episcopalians and most devout Reformers in this country, a general reference is made to the “ Institution of a Christian Man,” one of the formularies of Faith set forth by authority in the reign of Henry. We had recourse to that tract, and found the words quoted by Mr. Vaughan almost verbatim as he has given them ; but the import of the terms, taken in connection with the subject discussed and the intention of the writer, is, indeed, very different from that which is meant to be conveyed by the author of the “ Corruptions.” The number of office-bearers in the church, claiming a spiritual character, had, as is well known, greatly increased prior to the epoch of the Reformation, and actually become a positive abuse ; for which reason it appeared desirable in the eyes of his majesty’s advisers to cut off the orders, if so they might be called, of sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, and janitors, all of whom had certain duties assigned to them in the regular service. These appointments, at the same time, are ascribed to the “ holy fathers of the church which succeeded the Apostles,” and not to the Apostles themselves, who, as far as the record of the New Testament shows, confined their ordinations to deacons or ministers, and priests or bishops.

This statement, when distinctly made, does of a truth coincide with the judgments of the “ most learned episcopalians ;” it being by such men universally held, that the Apostles ordained only presbyters and deacons to serve in the church ; themselves being the third or highest order as long as they lived, and discharging the duties which (so far as uninspired persons were competent) were afterwards performed by the bishops properly so called. There is no token here that the Reformers considered prelacy as a merely human institution. They assert no more than that the Apostles limited the spiritual commissions issued by them to two orders of clergymen, and did not, like the Roman Catholics, sanction a multitude of inferior grades. Nay, that they were good episcopalians, and set a high value on the clerical function, viewed as a divine ordinance, will appear from their own words :—

“ We think it convenient that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge, that the sacrament of orders may worthily be called a sacrament, because it is a holy rite or ceremony instituted by Christ and his Apostles in the New Testament, and doth consist of two parts, like as the other sacraments of the church do, that is to say, of a spiritual and an invisible grace, and

also of an outward and a visible sign. The invisible gift or grace conferred in this sacrament is nothing else but the power, the office, and the authority before mentioned. The visible and outward sign is the prayer and imposition of the bishop's hands upon the person, which receiveth the said gift or grace. And to the intent that the church of Christ should never be destituted of such ministers as should have and execute the said power of the keys, it was also ordained and commanded by the Apostles, that the same sacrament should be applied and administered by the bishop, from time to time, unto such other persons as had the qualities necessarily required thereunto; which said qualities the Apostles did also very diligently describe, as it appeareth evidently in the third chapter of the first Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, and the last chapter of his Epistle unto Titus.*

Mr. Vaughan further maintains, as may be seen above, that the English Reformers in the reign of Henry VIII. admitted that "every shade of official inequality in the pastors of the church had been introduced *by the laws of men, and not by any ordinance of God.*" We cannot discover such an expression in the whole of the "Institution," the only treatise referred to; and we are perfectly sure it is not used by the author of the said formulary, in the sense which the ingenious Professor of History wishes to leave upon the minds of his readers. It is, no doubt, mentioned that the several degrees of clerical jurisdiction, so far as such power was connected with civil government and required the law of the land to support it, were measured out by Christian kings and emperors to bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and popes; and this narrative is accompanied with the assertion of a right on the part of sovereign princes to resume, when they please, the authority which they may have delegated to the prelates of their dominions. Perhaps it is on the following paragraph that Mr. Vaughan founds his remark, so little in unison with fact, that the English Reformers regarded the official inequality of their clergy, as proceeding from the laws of men, and not from any ordinance of God:—

"It is out of all doubt that the priests and bishops never had any authority by the Gospel to punish any man by corporal violence; and, therefore, they were oftentimes moved of necessity to require Christian princes to interpose their authority, and by the same to constrain and reduce inobedient persons unto the obedience and good order of the church; which the Christian princes, as God's ministers, in that part, and for the zeal they had to the establishing of Christ's religion, not only did gladly execute, but did also give unto priests and bishops further power and jurisdiction in certain other temporal and civil matters,

* See Formularies of Faith, set forth by Authority during the reign of Henry VIII., pp. 104—105. Printed at Oxford, 1825.

like as by the laws, statutes, immunities, privileges, and grants, of the princes made in that behalf, and by the uses also and customs of sundry realms and regions, it doth manifestly appear. And, therefore, it was and shall be always lawful unto the said kings and princes, and their successors, with the consent of their parliaments, to revoke and call again into their own hands, or otherwise to restrain all the power and jurisdiction which was given and assigned unto priests and bishops by the licence, consent, sufferance, and authority of the said kings and princes, and not by the authority of God or his Gospel, whensoever they shall have such grounds and causes so to do, as shall be necessary, wholesome, and expedient, for the weal of their realms, the repressing of vice, and the increase of Christ's faith and religion."

All these claims and reservations on the part of the civil government bore a reference to the usurped authority of the pope in secular matters, and had no respect whatever to the "official inequality in the pastors of the church." It is not, therefore, honest in Mr. Vaughan, when he lectures on the corruptions of Christianity, to inform his audience that the Reformers of England in the times of the Tudors acknowledged that prelacy had been introduced by the laws of men, and not by any ordinance of God.

We find no fault with him, when he discovers that Christians were more disinterested, pure, and simple, before their religion enjoyed the patronage of the state, than they became when their ambition was excited by the hope of preferment and the love of wealth. Nor do we question the accuracy of his criticism, when he tells his readers that the word Church, in the days of the Apostles, did not mean the aggregate of all the congregations throughout a whole nation, but merely an assembly of private worshippers in one place with their presbyters and deacons. It will also be admitted that in the primitive ages the bonds of association among the disciples of Christ were all strictly voluntary; and that every man who became a part of this visible brotherhood by a profession of faith in the Redeemer, became such as the result of his own free choice. Finally, we object not to the conclusion to which the author points all his remarks, namely, that the churches constructed on this strictly voluntary principle, and thus wholly spiritual in their character, were separate and *independent* communities, so far as the management of their temporal affairs was concerned. As to belief and discipline, however, they were all under the bonds of obligation to one apostolic head, considered as two great bodies of Jewish or Gentile converts; for, with regard to the latter, St. Paul himself declares, that on him devolved the "care of all the churches." Thus, though Independents in one sense, the primitive believers were episcopalians

in another; for while, by their ecclesiastical constitution, they had two orders of ministers to discharge clerical duties, they enjoyed at the same time the inspection of a superintendent, clothed with powers incomparably greater than belong to a modern bishop. If Mr. Vaughan can point out an epoch, however brief in its duration, when the assemblies of the faithful were not under a superintendence distinct from that of their officiating ministers, we shall consent to become Independents. But if there be any truth in ecclesiastical history, we are justified in asserting that there was no such period. As the Apostles died, or were otherwise removed from the scene of their labours, they were succeeded in their office of governors by such men as Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; and when these holy fathers became bishops at Rome, Antioch, and Smyrna, there were, it may be safely presumed, more than one congregation of Christians in each of those cities with its contiguous district.

We know it is maintained that, as the Apostles were inspired, and possessed a peculiar authority, their office could not be hereditary; that it could not descend to others; that it could not become a precedent to others. In a restricted use of language we are ready to admit what is here asserted. The supernatural powers, with which they were invested on the day of Pentecost, were not handed down to their successors; a remark which will also apply to the inferior ministers of the Redeemer, many of whom could work miracles, and speak with tongues of which no human exertion could have given them the command. But as presbyters and deacons could preach and administer the sacraments without the aid of a special inspiration, so could bishops, as succeeding to the superintending authority of the Apostles, execute their office without the accompaniment of signs and wonders.

The Professor in the London University, however, sees things in a different light, and finds, that on the death of the Apostles "every Christian church possessed the freedom of a separate republic." But, he adds,—

"It is, nevertheless, unquestionable that before the close of the second century a nominal precedence, which was occasionally conceded to some one presbyter by his brother presbyters, began to acquire an *official* and *permanent* character. It is, moreover, true, that as the necessary appointment of a chairman in the smaller meetings of presbyters served thus to create the new order of ecclesiastics afterwards known exclusively by the name of *bishops*, so the appointment of a moderator in the councils, which began to be convened in certain districts about the same period, produced the embryo—if we may so speak—of those dignitaries, who, subsequent to the age of Constantine, were so extensively obeyed under the name of metropolitans, primates, and archbishops."

This hypothesis of the presiding presbyter passing into the diocesan bishop, has been often attempted and as often exposed as a groundless fancy. But Mr. Vaughan has greater difficulties than this to contend with; for he is compelled to admit that it was while the Church was enjoying her independent condition—her republican freedom—her strictly voluntary principle—that most of the corruptions, which he so eloquently bewails, sprang up in her bosom, and were cordially embraced. Not only did she err grievously in point of doctrine, when profession of the faith of Christ was the result of every man's free choice; when nothing was done by constraint, but everything with a willing mind; she also relinquished the path of liberty as to ecclesiastical rule, and of her own accord bent the neck to episcopal dominion. And what is still more perplexing, there remains not on record, in the pages of primitive history, one complaint uttered by the reluctant presbyters, who saw their privileges torn from them by an aspiring brother; nor by the general body of the faithful, who witnessed the process of usurpation whereby the lords over God's inheritance accomplished their ambitious project. On the contrary, this nefarious plan, which aimed at nothing less than a revolution in the great Christian commonwealth, seems to have been so universally connived at by the republican voluntaries of those simple times, that it is impossible to discover on their part any trace or symptom of resistance. In fact, it was not till the fourth century, says Mr. Vaughan, when the Church had become decidedly episcopalian, that true learning began to flourish, and the primitive corruptions to be disgraced and expelled from her pale.

It was reserved, he confesses, for the improved literature of that more advanced age, to restore in a great measure those views of the Trinity, of the fallen state of man, and of the doctrines of grace, which had been obscured and impaired by the dogmas of an anti-Christian philosophy. The statements adopted on these points in synods and general councils, after the close of the third century, may not have been in all respects such as inspired men would have put forth; but, he adds, they were in much nearer unison with the faith once delivered to the saints than would have been published by any such assembly before that time. Many of the old misconceptions were retained, and others were incorporated with them; but, as a whole, he maintains, it was no small improvement on the past. In other words, Mr. Vaughan acknowledges that, in proportion as the Church became corrupted in her polity and discipline, she became more orthodox in her doctrines; that, as she receded from the sincere and simple motives which were wont to induce men to enter into her communion, she gradually threw off the errors of her primitive state, her

philosophical heresies and heathenish propensities; and that, to the extent in which she yielded to the decisions of her assembled prelates and to the authority of ecclesiastical law, to the same extent did she obtain clearer views of divine truth, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. How far this result is consistent with the praise which, in other respects, he bestows on the earliest professors of the Gospel in uninspired times, we take not upon us to determine; but it seems to follow, that, as long as Christians continued to be Independents, (granting that they ever were,) they were chargeable with much error in their theological tenets, and no small corruption in their forms of worship.

But the question still recurs, were the Apostolical Fathers really guilty of holding and teaching corrupt doctrines? We have unhesitatingly admitted that some of the early writers on Christianity, especially such as had been educated in the Pagan schools, were very apt to introduce into their treatises unsuitable illustrations, and even to attempt the engraftment of Gospel-truths upon the branches of science to which their studies had been previously devoted. In this way both the Jew and the Gentile laboured to deform the simplicity of the faith originally promulgated by the inspired servants of the Redeemer. But, though they exerted all their powers to systematise the religion of Jesus on the basis of their former belief, they did not reject, or materially change, any of the essential articles of the primitive creed. That they occasionally viewed them through a false medium, we do not deny; and that they sometimes associated them with foolish inventions and gross conceits, we have often seen reason to lament; but we have not seen any evidence to convict them either of casting away the pearls which were put into their hands, or of wishing to substitute false ones in their stead.

The title of Mr. Osburn's book—"Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical and Early Fathers"—is calculated at once to alarm and to mislead. Finding that the Roman Catholics, in all their controversies with Protestants, lay great stress on the opinions and usages of primitive times, he imagined that a valuable service might be rendered to the cause of the Reformation, by showing that the Christian writers of the first ages are not worthy of much reliance; that they have fallen into many mistakes; and that, yielding to the propensity which everywhere prevailed around them, they were not a little addicted to the most contemptible superstitions. Great caution is necessary in making such charges; for if we once encourage the persuasion that those venerable persons, who were taught from the mouths of the Apostles, who received their Epistles, listened to their admonitions, were enlightened by their private counsels, and succeeded them in the ministry

of reconciliation, are nevertheless justly accused of embracing and propagating erroneous opinions, we shall, it is to be feared, remove one of the pillars on which the fabric of Christian belief has long reposed. If it shall ever become a popular conviction that Clement, Barnabas and Justin did not understand the lessons communicated to them by St. Paul and St. Peter, or wilfully deviated from the path in which they were instructed to walk, the authority of the first martyrs will be greatly diminished; and a suspicion may arise among acute controversialists, that the argument for the faith and polity of the Church ought not to be rashly extended beyond the days of Constantine.

We anticipate the reply which will be made to such suggestions, namely, that we possess the sacred volume—the fountain of all pure doctrine, and the standard of all sound opinion. But can any one fail to recollect, that the Scriptures of the New Testament were long in the hands of those very men, whose sense or honesty we are taught to call in question; and that it is to their discrimination, we owe a large portion of the sacred volume in the form in which we now have it! The canon of the Christian Scriptures was fixed and determined by the Apostolical and early Fathers, whose doctrinal errors it is at present the fashion to magnify and blaze abroad; and if their notions of divine truth were, indeed, corrupt, what security have we that, among the numerous writings in their hands, bearing the names of Gospels and Inspired Epistles, they chose the right ones, and did not reject some of the very best, merely because the sentiments contained in them were contrary to those which they themselves professed. In short, the contents of the New Testament were selected from a variety of similar compositions which had acquired a certain currency among believers; and this important task was performed at a time when there were no guardians of orthodoxy besides the fidelity and zeal of the principal members of the Church, those very individuals whose judgment, purity and soundness we are exhorted to suspect.

It is admitted, however, even by those who accuse them of false opinions, that the Fathers were good, pious persons, and consequently, that all their aberrations from the line of heavenly truth were the result of a bad education, perverted intellect, and a powerful bias towards a mystical superstition. Mr. Vaughan himself graciously acknowledges, that “while the theological system of the primitive Fathers was so far defective, and even unscrip-
“tural, it is evident that their piety was of that firmly rooted
“description which eminently fitted them for the unsettled times
“on which they were thrown. Their character was much more
“Apostolic than their creed; and we may well pity the moral
“taste of any man, who, after reading their productions, and en-

“deavouring to realize their circumstances, is not constrained to render an unusual homage to their bold integrity and their philanthropic devotion. If they retained the truth but partially, and often with a strong mixture of error, it was retained with their whole heart, and proved enough to stay them in persecution and in death.”

The learned Professor might have said nearly as much for the saints of the Mahomedan calendar, and finished an ambiguous eulogy by remarking that the men were sincere, but held “a defective and unscriptural” creed. He admires their works, especially those of Cyprian; not in consequence of the theological truth which any of them contain, “for that is of small amount,” but for the refreshing proofs they afford of the “energy which the grace of heaven may infuse where religious knowledge is singularly imperfect, and mixed more or less on *all* points with erroneous conclusions.”

But what, after all, is the fact with regard to the actual amount of corrupt doctrine with which it pleases this author to charge those holy Fathers, whose energy was inspired by the “grace of heaven,” and whose hold of the truth, partial as it was, stayed them in persecution and in death? In point of absolute doctrine, distinctly and didactically stated by them, we find no evidence brought forward and no examples produced. As to the “causes of corruption,” we have details in the most unsparing abundance laid before us—indolence, credulity, prejudice, presumption, sensibility, disease, sensuality, worldliness, formality, vanity and pride—but with regard to their effect, as applicable to the primitive authors, we are simply reminded that the proof could not be produced without numerous extracts from their writings.

In perusing the works of the venerable persons whose reputation for knowledge and understanding is now placed in jeopardy, we do not conceal that we have occasionally received some offence from their want of taste, and, perhaps, also from their involuntary infractions of a sound logic. No one can derive any gratification from the solemn trifling, to which they are from time to time seen condescending, whether to please their fancies, or to meet the style of thinking which prevailed among their disciples. For example, when Clement of Alexandria undertakes to extend the term “childhood,” as used in Scripture, to persons of adult years also, he reasons as follows:—“I discover a spiritual childhood (*παιδεία*) even in Isaac; for Isaac signifies laughter, and the curious king saw him sporting (*παιζων*) with his wife Rebecca. The king’s name was Abimelek, which appears to me to denote the supermundane wisdom looking into the hidden mystery of this childhood. Rebecca means patience. O! what a wise sport was

this! Laughter is at play with Patience, and the king looks on from the window. But what was the window through which the Lord (Jesus) showed himself? Doubtless it was the flesh through which he was manifested."

In his controversy with Trypho, the Jew, the venerable martyr Justin thinks proper to conduct his argument in this manner. "The *tree* of the cross, after He had been crucified upon it, of whose glorious advent the prophets had foretold, became a symbol of the tree of life, which is planted in the paradise of God. Moses by a *rod* accomplished the deliverance of the children of Israel; with that rod he divided the Red Sea, and caused the water to flow from the rock. Casting a *tree* into the bitter waters of Marah he made them sweet. Jacob made his uncle's sheep conceive by casting rods into the water. The same Jacob boasts that with his rod he crossed the river. The rod of Aaron that budded proclaimed Christ to be a priest; for he was the rod that was to spring out of the stem of Jesse, as Esaias saith; and David speaks of him as the tree planted by the rivers of waters which beareth its fruit in due season. God appeared to Abraham from the tree; as it is written 'from the oak in Mamre.' The children of Israel in passing through the wilderness, found seventy-two *palm-trees* and twelve wells. David said that he was comforted by the *rod* and staff of God. Elisha cast *wood* into the river Jordan, and raised the head of the axe wherewith the children of the prophets were about to fell trees to build a house, that they might therein meditate on the law of God; and we also sinking and being submersed in the waters of baptism through the weight of our most heavy transgressions, are delivered by one crucified upon the *tree*, who purifies us by prayer, and makes us a *house* of prayer and worship."

This species of writing found favour in the eyes of the primitive people to whom it was addressed; it displayed an exercise of ingenuity which in those days was highly valued; and it suggested a variety of interesting recollections and solemn images which gratified the pious mind. Nor did this play of fancy involve the sacrifice of any cardinal principle whether of faith or morals. The figures and personifications which crowd the pages of those ancient authors constitute a resemblance to the more serious efforts of John Bunyan; and we may presume that, in the rhetorical delineations of Clement and Justin, as well as in those of our popular countryman, the style was recommended by a conviction of its use, its practical adaptation to the habits and taste of the great majority of readers.

It ought to be remarked, too, that, as it was not the object of the Gospel to convey the knowledge of physical science, of

astronomy, geology, or chemistry, the early fathers were not raised above the mass of their contemporaries, in regard to a more enlightened acquaintance with the laws of nature. Hence, their belief in magic, exorcism, and miracles, betrayed the prevailing principles of their age, without throwing any reflection on the genius of Christianity. Their notions, again, relative to supernatural agents manifested an excessive degree of credulity; inducing them to receive improbable accounts of angels, good and bad, and to identify with celestial warnings the ordinary visions of the night. The same weakness sometimes led them to entertain superstitious feelings with respect to the sacraments; to invest them with the power of charms; and also to use the sacred elements as effectual means for driving away malignant spirits, or for inviting the benevolent and gracious. The obligations, moreover, of celibacy and asceticism were congenial to the feelings of the times, and soon connected themselves with certain precepts in the New Testament, which seemed to recommend perpetual virginity and a severe bodily abstinence. The sign of the cross, it may be added, was frequently employed with views which indicated an improper reliance upon mere forms and outward observances; the usual resource of a people, whose minds cannot comprehend the full requisition of a spiritual worship, and who find it easier to give occupation to the hand, than to raise the soul to the contemplation of invisible excellences.

Could these practices and notions, inseparable from a rude state of society, be regarded as *doctrines*, we should at once concur with our two authors, that the truths of Christianity were corrupted in the second century, and that the fathers might have had justly imputed to them the guilt of doctrinal errors. But so long as we can distinguish between a usage and a tenet—between a figure of speech and an institute of Christ—so long will we defend the first professors of our holy religion against the heavy charge of having taught for the commandments of God the mere ordinances of men.

The second of the books mentioned at the head of this article, is evidently the work of a young man, whose talents and acquirements are of a high order, and who possesses zeal equal to his learning. There are, however, in his volume, marks of haste and perhaps of precipitation; while we do not perceive very clearly what is the object which he intends to accomplish. To deprive the Roman Catholics of the aid of the Fathers by representing these last as foolish reasoners, bad writers, and erroneous teachers, is to perform a very ambiguous service to our common Christianity—reminding the reader of the manifold hazards which attend a sword in the hand of a madman, and fire in the possession of a child. The

enemies of truth will avail themselves of such weapons supplied from the armoury of a believer, and will rejoice over such an ally, who fights their battles under the apostolic flag.

The Bishop of Lincoln has set a good example as to the manner of handling the works of the primitive authors; showing that, though the illustrations employed by them may not be unexceptionable, the true doctrines of the Gospel are neither sacrificed nor relinquished; and that, even when the essential principles of the faith are not brought prominently forward, they are obviously implied and taken for granted. Represented in this light, the labours of Justin and Tertullian rise in our esteem; we see their value as links of evidence and sources of information; and we learn to ascribe their imperfections to the circumstances under which they wrote, and their apparent deficiencies to the limited nature of the purposes which their several tracts were meant to serve. Hereafter, if our auguries fail not, Mr. Osburn will produce something more to our satisfaction, better calculated to promote the cause which he has at heart, and fitted at the same time to become the foundation of a lasting fame.

- ART. VII.—1. *Songs of the Prophecies.* By M. S. Milton. London, 1835: Baldwin & Cradock. Tait, Edinburgh; and Cumming, Dublin. pp. 240.
2. *A Voice from the Dormitory: being a Collection of Sacred Poems, the Majority of which are from old Authors.* London, 1835: Smith, Elder, & Co., Cornhill. pp. 114.
3. *Sacred Poetry.* By a Layman. London, 1835: Seeley & Sons. pp. 194.

VERSE is so sadly at a discount, that we can only venture to afford a very small space to the specimens with which we now present our readers. Yet we feel that, in a philosophical point of view, it would be well, if, in these days, amidst the tumult of politics and the irritations of controversy, the souls of men were more often soothed, and refreshed, and harmonized, by the charm of imaginative description, the influences of moral song, and even the cadences and modulations of musical rhythm. More especially we are sure, that our deepest gratitude is due to the merciful wisdom of our God, over the pages of whose inspiration is scattered so much of the sublimest poetry to which human ears have ever listened; and that there can scarcely be a finer or more improving exercise for the mind and heart, than to have recourse

to the strains of Isaiah, and David, and the Book of Job, merely for the effect which they must produce in restoring and exalting the tone of sentiment. To see the poetry of a land decay from the growth of an utilitarian spirit, is to behold an inauspicious omen for its literature, its religion, and its national character.

The three productions, prefixed to this article, we have endeavoured to arrange in the order of merit. The first has more originality than the second; and the second we prefer to the third, because it is better to collect what is old and good, than to write what is very indifferent.

The "*Songs of the Prophecies*" are heralded by an "*Introductory Chapter*," and interspersed with some "*Historical Sketches*,"—as of the Cities of the Plain, Tyre and Babylon,—which have all some merit and some interest. There is really, too, in the "*Songs*" themselves (why called *Songs*, by the way?) a great deal of poetical feeling and expression. With some persons, indeed, it may be a question, whether to make songs of the scriptural prophecies be not an attempt even more superfluous, than

"To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
To add a perfume to the violet;"

and the writer is fairly chargeable with some close imitations of Lord Byron (not to use the ugly words thefts and plagiarisms)—with occasional affectation—with some neologisms, which are to us corruptions of the English language—with, now and then, a brave contempt of quantity—and, sometimes, a loose carelessness of metre, which, though certainly not a very noble or difficult achievement, would appear to modern versifiers, who are apt to mistake slovenliness for ease and power, as "a grace beyond the reach of art." Yet, when these blemishes and drawbacks are admitted, there remains much which we must cordially admire, much for which we could desire a more extended circulation than probably awaits it.

The following stanzas exhibit, together with some beauties, many of the faults which we have specified:—

"A torch he dashes through the banner'd hall,
Where many a trophy of forgotten times
Waved its long drapery from the lofty wall,
With the flags torn from Zoroaster's climes;
And the wild shriek of female anguish chimes,
Musically, to his desperate soul—*Away*,
Away, dash on the flames! the red fire climbs
The lofty fabrics, and its glittering play
Crimson'd a thousand cheeks, blanch'd pale with death's dismay!

“ Aloft, on high, a *jiend-lord*, he stood,
 Spirit-like, unapproachable, alone,
 Now in his hour of dying hardihood ;
 As if the fire of his ancestors shone,
 In one tremendous lightning flash, t' atone,
 Upon the altar of eternal fame,
 With an old race and empire overthrown,
 To the unborn and buried, for the shame
 Of his supineness, in one sacrifice of flame ! ”—p. 97.

Very near, likewise, we find the expressious “ *lord-king*,” “ *storm-clouds*,” “ prophetic ear,” which ought to have been marked as a *quotation*, and sundry others which any sensible friend of the author would have expunged. The line about the “ *jiend-lord*” we cannot *scan* ; nor, again, such lines as

“ And more sable, deep, and billowy, over all.”

This latter line is the more to be regretted, as it occurs in an account of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, which is written, not without some strange faults of taste, yet with considerable solemnity and power.

The following description of the appearance of the scene after the awful catastrophe may speak for itself.

“ Tomb of all nature ! there it sleeps the same
 As morn beheld it ; and the Syrian night,
 Lighting the hill-tops with its dying flame,
 Over that Dead Sea, brings no change of sight.
 Unbroken by the lonely bittern’s flight,
 In silent solitude, as o’er it rose
 The sun, that orb holds on his path-way bright,
 Rejoicing wheresoe’er his beauty goes,
 Saving its sterile shores, where life no longer grows.

“ No tree, nor shrub, nor flower blossoming there !
 A sombre, sullen waste !—from far below,
 The dark funereal waters lave the bare
 And rocky mountain-sides ; *or deep, deep, oh !*
 Full many a fathom down, their currents flow
 ‘Mid Sodom’s tenantless, dim halls of stone !
 And through Gomorrah’s vaulted chambers go,
 Sounding a mournful dirge—a spiritual moan,
 O’er the wild tribes who slumber, graveless and unknown.

“ No lily lifts its alabaster cup
 Unto the morning dews ; no lotus blue
 Raises its incense-perfumed chalice up
 To kiss the sunbeams ; nor the mazy clew

Of tangle-weed streams, with its emerald hue,
 Far down, like fairy forests, cheerfully—
 Life hath no being there ! Destruction drew
 A curtain o'er the dead, on which shall be
 No shadow of a change unto eternity.

“ Time, marching on for centuries steadily,
 Hath left no footprint on that mighty, drear,
 And dismal ocean's awful mystery—
 A nation's grave—and Nature's desert bier !
 And are they gone—the towers that, tier on tier,
 Rivalled all earthly grandeur ? Are the halls
 And thrones of kings and empires buried here ?
 Past and forgotten, as a dead leaf falls,
 Their temples, towers, and domes, and adamantine walls ?

“ O God, is all the life, which madly flow'd
 Within a million bosoms, ceased and gone ?
 Is the dream over ? Are their bodies *strew'd*
 Like forest leaves ? Is every vestige flown
 Of those who sleep beneath that ocean's moan ?
 Sodom, Gomorrah, grand and mighty, lo !
 Have ye not left one monumental stone,
 One trophied pile, by which mankind may know
 Where rests the giant warrior on his broken bow ?

“ Alas ! no, not a stone ! Ye take your sleep
 Beneath the silent waters ; and the tale
 Of sorrow the sepulchral waves shall keep
 In cavern'd secrecy, save when they sail
 Before the tempests, with a dirge-like wail,
 Singing the requiem, slow and sullenly,
 Of the lost maiden and her lover pale
 And perish'd, far within that sable sea,
 Shrouding a people, and their dark iniquity.” —pp. 72—74.

“ Thou that hast language and a prophet cry
 In every rolling billow ! Thou that art
 The gulph and tomb, o'er which the majesty
 Of much on earth is tottering to depart
 Into thy caverns ! Picture, and the chart
 Where destiny hath traced the doom of things ;
 Mirror of horror, where the soul must start
 To see its shadow imaged in thy springs ;
 Lone monitor of nations, empires, thrones, and kings !

“ Sleep on in everlasting solitude !
 Man may despise, but cannot change thy power
 And spell upon the spirit. For his rude
 Dull sneer of mockery, from splendour's bower,

As soon might stir thy billowy breast, or cower
 Thy stormy march ; thou cenotaph of all
 Earth's strength, and splendour, column, temple, tower,
 And hall, and palace ! Thou funereal pall,
 Drawn by the hand of heav'n over earth's second fall !

“ Sleep, as thou hast, thro' centuries of war,
 Blood, revolution, fire, or famine, slept !
 And may thy name, albeit a darken'd star
 Of prophecy fulfilled and set, be wept
 By hearts to which earth's venom hath not crept,
 Poisoning their sources with its touch of pride,
 In breasts, where Nature's freshness yet hath left
 Some sympathy, that wretches may deride,
 But can no more divert than thy almighty tide !”—p. 77.

Next comes a “ *Voice from the Dormitory.*” We cannot admire the dedication, which is sadly wanting in simplicity: and we think the title awkward, unintelligible, and most injudicious. Pope, and every body else, must laugh at the poet,

“ Sleepless himself, to give his readers sleep :”

but here we have the boldest association proclaimed between poetry and sleep, which we ever remember to have seen; for really “ *a voice*” issuing from “ *the dormitory*” seems to tell the reader before-hand, whither he must expect to be sent. The collection itself, however, we can most safely recommend:—it is an unexceptionable manual at once of piety and poetry. The following version we extract as curious:—

“ PSALM C.

SIR PHILIP SIDNEY.

O all ye landes, the treasures of your joy,
 In merry shout upon the Lord bestow :
 Your service cheerfully on him employ,
 With triumph song into his presence go.
 Know first that he is God ; and after know
 This God did us, not we ourselves create :
 We are his flock, for us his feedings grow !
 We are his folk, and he upholds our state.
 With thankfulness O enter then his gate :
 Make through each porch of his your praises ring.
 All good, all grace, of his high name relate,
 He of all grace and goodness is the Spring.
 Time in no terms his mercy comprehends,
 From age to age his truth itself extends.”—p. 100.

As to the remaining volume, intitled "Sacred Poetry, by a Layman," we are unwilling to blame, and unable to commend. The author appears to have borne in mind the old dictum about "*mediocribus esse poetis;*" and, finding that he could not rise above the unendurable mediocrity, has contrived to sink below it. What, at least, can be said of "*An Evening Thought?*"

" 'Tis sov'reign grace reigns o'er our day,
 And broodeth o'er our night :
 Who has not seen its sweet display,
 In contemplation's light ?
 " O, when the fitful day is gone,
 And night's still hour doth bring
 The works that in the day were done,
 For contemplation's wing,
 " How doth it soar above?—*abash'd,*
 It drops its heavy wings ;
 And, in the frailty, *abas'd,*
 To sov'reign mercy clings."—*Sacred Poetry*, p. 105.

Other specimens are, indeed, better: but we cannot discover one that is positively good. Still we are glad to see the words "*a new edition,*" in the title page:—for there are many readers, who require in "*Sacred Poetry*" a peculiar kind of unction, knowing and caring very little about literary qualities and pretensions. This unction these pages possess; but without the addition of any thing offensive:—being, so far, unlike those *religious erotics*, which we took the liberty to reprobate in our last number; unlike, again, certain verses by the Reverend Mr. Smith, the *ci-devant* boatswain, which we have seen in the newspapers, where the Redeemer of the world is styled "*Jesus, our Lord High Admiral,*" the question being first asked, "*Are you for the land of Canaan?*" and where the slang of nautical phrases is mixed up with expressions meant to be superlatively evangelical, in a way which we dare not describe, and will not characterise.

ART. VIII.—1. *Episcopal and Clerical Duty and Responsibility considered in Reference to Ireland, in a Letter respectfully addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, on his Lordship's Charge against the Established Church Home Mission.* By the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee, A. B. Dublin: W. Curry, jun. and Co.; London, Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1835.

2. *The Divine Patience exhausted through the making void the Divine Law. A Sermon preached at Camden Chapel, Camberwell, on Sunday, the 26th April, 1835.* By Henry Melvill, A. M., Minister of the Chapel, and late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. Published at the Request of the Congregation. London: Rivingtons. 1835.

3. *The Established Church: Letters on the Voluntary Principle.* By a Quiet Looker On. Published in the Morning Chronicle of the 2d and 3d October, 1834. London: Ridgway and Sons. 1834.

4. *The Present Position of Church and State described; the Cause assigned; and the Remedy proposed.* By a Clergyman of the Church of England. London: Nisbet. 1835.

IF our readers will have the kindness to recollect the invariable tone of our observations; and if they will revert for a moment to the articles, in this present number, on the state of religion at Geneva, and on the Irish Church; they will perceive that we are no advocates of a low unevangelical standard of doctrine, or of a lax and careless maintenance of the truth; they will perceive, also, that we are not disposed to treat the Popish agitators, whether lay or ecclesiastical, with any thing of the favour which bespeaks indecision or timidity; and, again, that we are unwilling, rather than solicitous, to enter upon the general question of imparting a missionary character to the establishment. We deem it, however, the express office of *consistency*, no less than of moderation, to show that a dislike of one excess shall not betray us into an alliance with its opposite: while we daily see more and more reason for asserting, with reference to *particular persons*, that it is far better to be the noiseless instrument of good in a single spot, than to rush like a high-pressure locomotive engine, with a hundred horse power of disturbance, boiling and almost bursting in the impetuosity of its course.

“The Church Militant” appears to be a phrase more applicable now than ever, and realized in a greater variety of ways. It is the universal opinion, that its members, collectively and indivi-

dually, either are engaged, or are on the eve of being engaged, in warfares of no ordinary kind. Their comfort must be, that they are not aggressive, but defensive, combatants. They would invade no province, they would provoke no adversary; but they have to guard and maintain all that is near and dear to them as citizens and Christians.

Above all, by an eventful combination of circumstances, the Church of Rome is thought to be once more raising its head against the Church of England. A renewed and mighty struggle seems to be expected, even within the limits of the British empire, between the principles of Popery, and the principles of Protestantism. Some, of course, may not apprehend that the contest will be quite so desperate, or that the foe is quite so formidable, as their neighbours have imagined. They may not apprehend that the Papacy can ever re-enthral the mind of Europe, or build up again that gigantic fabric of spiritual dominion which was once the terror and astonishment of the world—golden in its gorgeousness, and adamantine in its strength. But this is matter of conjecture. A jealousy and dread of the Roman Catholics may be reasonably entertained, at a period when they are enabled, and tempted, to exhibit afresh the more hideous and malignant features of their system; and when they evince, in Ireland at least, and occasionally in England, a strong and growing bias to a most unnatural alliance with anarchy and radicalism. We have, moreover, lived long enough to learn, that no enemies are to be despised; and that, be they who they may, it is better to meet and overcome them, while they are in the comparative infancy of their resources, than wait until time has matured their power, and successes have inspired them with confidence.

Nor can it be necessary for us to say, that to the genius of Popery we are altogether opposed, both in its religious aspect and its political. We recoil from it for its tendency to enslave the understanding, and delude the conscience. We would spend our last efforts in resisting its usurpations. But we are, therefore, the more anxious about the manner in which the conflict is conducted. We are the more anxious that, *on our side*, Christian forbearance should be blended with Christian courage, and Christian discretion with Christian zeal; lest our cause should be dishonoured and our banners sullied; lest, by our folly, we should turn over to the hostile array the best advantages which we possess; lest, by our exaggerations, we should transmute right into wrong; lest, by our violence, we should even enlist the sympathies of the honest and humane in behalf of our antagonists.

Now, we have already more than once warned the ministers and members of the Church of England, on the spreading evil of

extremes in religion. We repeat that caution again, whether it be heard, or neglected. We add too, *that there may be, and that there is, around us, the extreme of Ultra-Protestantism.* Many may be startled by this assertion, and some shocked. We would proceed, then, to explain and illustrate our meaning. Mr. Stoney may be hardly a fair instance; but we extract from the newspapers of May 27th, his answers to the Education Commissioners, as exhibiting in its highest and most truculent state of excitation, the *animus* which we deplore.

“Has the number of Protestants been stationary, increasing, or diminishing, within the last five years; and if increasing or diminishing, to what extent, and what has occasioned such increase or diminution?—A. The number is increasing yearly, and would be greater than the church would hold only for Popish persecution. The parish priest preaches in his chapel the destruction of those who read the Bible, by pitchforks, bogholes and pavingstones, and is not ashamed to avow it on oath before the magistrates of the country. Protestants are threatened to be murdered, violently assaulted and beaten, and their property destroyed; their remains torn from the grave; husbands taught to beat their wives, and wives to abandon their husbands and children, to force them to leave the church and go to mass.

“What number of clergymen of the Roman Catholic church belong to or officiate in the parish?—Two priests say mass on Sundays, and preach the above doctrines. One in the country drinks whisky, expels devils, and reads a gospel for sick beasts.

“What number of places of worship belonging to Roman Catholics are there in the parish?—There are two mass-houses, out of one of which the king's troops had to fly from the seditious harangues of the priest, and in which the people are instructed in the art of defrauding and evading the payment of their legal debts, and abusing and murdering those in the Protestant clergyman's employment, by ‘walloping them with sticks.’ Such is the Christian and pious instruction publicly given by the priest in the Roman Catholic place of worship.

“How often in each week or month, or on what days is divine service performed therein respectively?—It is a horrid abuse of language to call the worship of wooden crosses, pictures, relics, and wafers, divine service.

“What is the average number of persons usually attending divine service in each of such places of Roman Catholic worship, at each time of the celebration of divine service therein?—I do not know. I do not go there. If the priest is asked, he will not give too low a return.

“Are there any places of worship belonging to other Protestant Dissenters in this parish?—There is no Protestant Dissenting house of worship in the parish, though some popularity-loving pro-Popery conciliators might wish to have such.

“Are there any, and how many, schools in the parish?—There are three daily Scripture schools and one Sunday school. There are some Popish schools, instituted by the priest, in connexion with the new

Education Commission, at whose board Satan sits shearing God's word of its glorious truths.

"Of the children so attending at each such school, what is the number of Protestants of the established church, and what the number of Roman Catholics, and of Presbyterians or other Protestant Dissenters respectively?—Most of the Protestant children of the parish attend the Sunday and daily schools. The Roman Catholic children would and frequently did attend, but the priest, who has fixed his residence close to the parochial school-house, persecutes them, hunts, stones, cudgels, cuffs, horsewhips, curses, calls out in the chapel, and tyrannizes over the unhappy victims of his fell superstition, so that they are forced to stay away from the Scripture-school, contrary to the wishes of both parents and children. The lash of the driver's whip was never more terrific to a West Indian slave, than the priest's whip and curse to a poor Irish peasant; the desolating slave system carried on in Africa is liberty itself when compared to the horrid tyranny of Irish priests, and the interminable sufferings they inflict. Some of the poor children are robbed of their books, some welted with horsewhips, some forced to run into the rivers, others confined to sick beds for weeks, from the brutal treatment they receive; some children may be seen going a great distance out of the way to avoid the infuriated priest and his cruel whip.

"What kind of instruction is afforded therein to the boys and girls respectively?—The instruction given in the Popish schools of this parish is still worse. Idolatry, rejection of the second commandment, praying to the Virgin Mary, image and saint worship, hatred to Protestants, hunting Scripture readers with pitchforks and stones, and shouting after them, for the young cock always crows like the old one."

But this matter we gladly leave, only subjoining the words of Lord Roden, who gave both a testimony to the character of Mr. Stoney, and a lecture to his intemperance.

"The Earl of Roden could not allow this conversation to terminate without bearing his testimony to the high character which Mr. Stoney had long held. With respect to the charge of the noble and learned lord opposite (Lord Brougham) that Mr. Stoney must be a man of unsound mind, he (the Earl of Roden) only wished that the noble and learned lord had half the soundness possessed by the gentleman to whom he had referred. He did not rise to vindicate the language used by Mr. Stoney as quoted by the noble viscount opposite; on the contrary, he thought it most improper. He must, however, say, that Mr. Stoney had long been an active and exemplary clergyman, *but had been subjected to great persecution and severe trials, not only from the Roman Catholics, but from Protestants who were opposed to those doctrines of the Gospel which he preached.* He (the Earl of Roden) would not justify that language, but hoped this would be a lesson of which Mr. Stoney would avail himself."

We turn to the publication of the Rev. R. J. Mc'Ghee, A.B.—a letter, written in a fervid, honest, intrepid spirit;—a letter, sometimes eloquent, and always energetic. But, alas, unless

under the direction of good sense, eloquence is at best a splendid mischief, and energy is a power injurious, because misemployed. It appears that the Bishop of Down and Connor had ventured to deliver a charge "*against the Established Church Home Mission*,"—a kind of society, as we gather chiefly from the pages before us, set on foot for the purpose of regenerating Ireland, and converting all its Papistical inhabitants by the instrumentality of itinerant preachers, sent forth into various districts from time to time: and having a committee, of which some among the members have actually arrived at the dignity of A.B. If not in the name, yet on the behalf, of that judicious and venerable committee, Mr. McGhee, as many of his statements indicate, although he certainly takes the whole responsibility on his single head, appears to have written; and on that account, we suppose, he feels himself authorized to address the Bishop in a tone of expostulatory remonstrance, which would otherwise have been quite insufferable in one of the subordinate clergy. Cowper describes in glowing terms the ancient priest whom Boadicea consulted:

"Sage beneath a spreading oak
Sat the Druid, hoary chief,
Ev'ry burning word he spoke,
Full of rage and full of grief.
"Rome shall perish:—write that word
In the blood which she has spilt,
Perish hopeless and abhorr'd,
Deep in ruin as in guilt."

Mr. McGhee strongly reminds us of this angry Druid. The expressions, "*sage*," and "*hoary chief*," are not, perhaps, applicable to the letter; nor may the word "*sat*" suitably describe so restless and peripatetic a personage; but the rest of the passage, with the "*rage*" and the "*grief*," and the denunciations of "*Rome*," may be reckoned curiously appropriate.

The *rage* may be best conceived, by superadding evangelical enthusiasm to the utmost warmth of an Irish temperament. But specimens are safer and more convincing than descriptions. Let our readers feast upon the following:—

"This question is to be asked concerning another class, concerning five-sixths of the population of Ireland. 'CAN A SINNER DEPEND UPON THE REFUGES AND GROUNDS OF HOPE THAT THE CHURCH OF ROME PROPOSES FOR THE SALVATION OF MAN'S IMMORTAL SOUL AND BE SAVED?'

"To this, my Lord, I answer, if superstition, if idolatry, if one of the darkest developments of Antichrist that the earth has ever seen, if these can bring salvation to the sinner's soul, then is it to be found in the refuges of lies which the Church of Rome, the 'Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of the Earth,' proposes for the salvation of the soul

of man. I presume not, my Lord, to speak of individuals; I speak of principles. I cannot tell how many may be saved by truths which they may have learned and embraced *in spite* of the idolatry and anti-Christian superstitions of their Church. I know not how many God may 'have reserved to himself' who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.' *But this I know*, that as surely as the salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ is the only refuge for the soul, the means of salvation propounded by Popery, are refuges of lies, of sin and death, and the sinner that lives and dies in dependence on them, *shall perish in his iniquity from the presence of his God.*"—p. 16, 17.

"The state of Ireland, with respect to the religious principles professed by its population, then, is this, my Lord; that five-sixths of the population are sunk in an anti-Christian idolatry, which brings not salvation, but perdition, to the soul of man; and there are vast multitudes of the remaining sixth, whose profession of religion is as far sunk in infidelity, as that of Popery is in superstition."—p. 17, 18.

Bishop Jebb is then soundly abused for a "*most melancholy exhibition of the principles of a minister of the Church of England;*" and we are told what an abomination it is

"to talk of 'a *very pious and attentive parish priest*!' a poor man who in direct proportion to the zeal with which he promoted the principles of his Church, was labouring in the work of Antichrist, and pillowing up the souls of his blinded fellow-sinners with the props of idolatry and superstition.

"To talk of *Divine Providence placing the souls of men under the care of such a pastor!* in any other sense than that in which Providence may be said to have placed men under any system of Heathenism or Paganism, in which he might be said to have placed the worshippers of Diana under the care of those who made silver shrines for the goddess! or the inhabitants of Lystra under the priests of Jupiter!"—p. 35.

Soon after, is a *tirade*, in which principles *partly* correct are perverted into error by the extravagant way in which they are enunciated;—

"Your Lordship having adverted to the state of our Church and country, I shall be excused if I venture to call your attention to the real facts of the case; and permit me to ask your Lordship, what is that iniquitous principle which is now laid down as the popular standard on which a government that calls itself Christian, ought to maintain an Established Religion in a country? It is this, my Lord—not that that religion is true—not that it is maintained by the Eternal Word of God—not that it is therefore the duty of a Christian government to maintain it on God's authority: no, but that it is pleasing to the majority of the people! Therefore, on this principle, if Mohammed, or Juggernaut, or the Sun, or the Devil, or *the Pope*, be the idol of Ireland, no Clergy are to be maintained who do not teach the religion of the people. There is hardly a newspaper in which this abstract principle is not laid down, and there is not a man of common observation who does not see, and know,

that it is the growing standard of public opinion, and that, according to which his Majesty's late Government were modelling their legislation for the Church of Ireland.

"Whence has this principle originated? How has a principle so at war with the very essence of the Christian faith—with the very vitality of truth—how has it been suffered to arise and grow up in the Church, so that the Senate of Britain can be brought to entertain and act upon it? It is through the *criminal neglect of the Bishops and Clergy*, my Lord, in this, that we have not held up the standard, the purity, the inestimable value of the principles of our religion—and proved that they were worthy to be established, by proving that they were worthy to be diffused throughout the land."—p. 44, 45.

But if we were to quote all the passages of this character, we should quote almost the entire publication. And yet men, animated with such a spirit, and breathing such language—language, how prudent, how moderate, how conciliatory!—are to form themselves into a Protestant Reformation Society, nay, *into a Church Missionary Society*:—such men are to go forth, as the Apostles of the nineteenth century, preaching and proselytizing, likening themselves, (in the name of piety and modesty!) to Timothy and Paul;—abjuring the rules of that establishment to which subordination has become a solemn duty,—abandoning the dull routine of quiet and ordinary ministrations,—scorning the narrow limits of pastoral and parochial localities. Oh! what can they do, but embroil a whole people, and, where the combustible materials are alas! already prepared, set a whole empire in conflagration?

At p. 65, the Bishop meets with a rub from the A.B. which is intended for an impressive castigation; and we beg to say, that the capital letters are not ours, but belong to Mr. M'Ghee.

"First, then, my Lord, your Lordship's statement of the ordination service appears to be **CONTRARY TO THE VERY NATURE OF OUR SACRED OFFICE**. Our office, if duly entered on, is undertaken in reference to a great principle, and not *to a particular place*."—p. 65.

Again,—

"On the whole, my Lord, as far as the Canons relate to the question, I have no doubt your Lordship will candidly admit that they furnish direct evidence against the whole tenor of your charge.

"Having, I must respectfully say, disproved your Lordship's premises, from the very Canons which you quote to establish them, it were unnecessary repetition to show how they must subvert the conclusions deduced from them."—p. 117, 118.

The Bishop is next asked,—

"What, if Bedell could see the power of Popery daring to suppress the Word of the Holy God from the National Education of the Protestant Children of Ireland; and not only a Protestant * * * * *, but a Protestant * * * * *, (I spare your Lordship the pain,) sitting in Divan with Popish

and Socinian Doctors, to mutilate the Bible to the taste of Superstition and Infidelity, and to send forth their corrupted substitute for the Sacred Volume, as an apology for a religious education for the nation? What if he could see Popery, I will not say legislating for the Protestant Church, but trampling on all the powers of legislation, and on all laws, human and divine, to overturn it?"—p. 152.

The whole is summed up in a passage which we beg to submit to the serious consideration of the Prelates and orthodox Clergy of the united Church of England and Ireland.

"Do the Bishops take care that the Gospel is faithfully preached to the immortal souls in their Dioceses? Do the Clergy preach the Gospel of Christ to the immortal souls in their Parishes?"

"I answer, my Lord, fearlessly, and confidently answer, without adverting to the capabilities, or knowledge of Bishops or Ministers, *that they do not*. I say, to the reproach and disgrace of our Church be it spoken, that as far as respects the fidelity of Bishops and Clergy, nearly five-sixths of the population of our country are totally and universally neglected; they are left without an effort, to perish in ignorance of the Gospel."—p. 157.

And this is said in confutation, and partly in denial, of an objection urged by the Bishop of Down and Connor, as resulting from this Missionary preaching, "Is it not an evil that a public allegation should be made, as a ground for these proceedings; that many parishes are unprovided with competent Ministers; that there are many whose Ministers are ignorant, slothful, worldly hirelings, that care not for the flock; that many Ministers preach not the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ?"

In the same temper, we read of "every parish in Ireland containing an altar, around which a wretched population is congregated, to *sacrifice to the demon* of idolatry, of superstition, of sedition, and of revolution;" while of Protestant efforts it is pretty broadly insinuated, that "so far from bringing glory to God, *such apathy, and want of fidelity and zeal for the salvation of men, bring reproach upon his cause and name*." Mr. Mc'Ghee shudders at every rag of Popery with a kind of rabid horror—a kind, if we may coin the expression, of *Papophobia*; and in ascribing all imaginable mischief to the priests, (whose intermeddling violence we have, assuredly, no disposition to defend,) he is always falling into that disastrous error, *the endeavour to prove too much*; so that he reminds us often of that marvellous production, by Mr. J. Bellenden Ker, "*The Archaeology of Popular Phrases, and Nursery Rhymes*," which is now spread out before us in its green honours of a second edition.*

* Little did we think ever to introduce to our readers the old "traditional jingles" of the nursery as an ecclesiastical publication. But a change has come over what Mr. Bellenden Ker is barbarian enough to call "these *noncanonic metrical farinos*." "The

But here the question comes, has this hyperbolical school—the school, of which we hear, with loud and perpetual boasts, that, for

reinstated specimens," he informs us, "are not offered as *models of composition*, nor as the *effusions of superior genius*, but simply for that which I believe them to have been. To me they seem popular Pasquinades, elicited by the soreness felt by the population at the intrusion of a foreign and onerous church-sway, bringing with it a ministry, to which a goaded people imputed fraud and exaction."—p. 244. Alas! it is very hard to disenchant us of the happy memories of our childhood—to bid us unlearn the music of those rhymes which soothed our little cares, as we sat upon the nurse's lap, undreaming of criticism. We asked not to be disabused; we were quite content with the "exquisite pleasure of being well deceived." We had no wish to be initiated in these erudite mysteries; we had no suspicion of exoteric and esoteric meanings; and if these things be corruptions, we only wish that all corruptions were as good, for they are worth the "reinstated" originals ten thousand times over. But the march of intellect has walked fairly into the nursery. It is nothing now that the gentleman in Molière had been talking pro-e all his life without knowing it; for we find that, from our very infancy, when we imagined ourselves to be repeating delicious nonsense in English, we were discoursing desperately dull philosophy in high Dutch. Ah, unconscious reformers!—ah, ignorant that what "*the nurse had taught*" was so much against "*the priest!*" But what an auxiliary is Mr. Bellenden Ker to Mr. McGhee and his friends! They, at least, ought to be grateful; and as most of these strains, we believe, have been set to befitting tunes, they are in duty bound to sing them to their children, not in the base vernacular, but in the foreign and proper idiom. We, however, must be so incorrigible as to adhere to the vulgar tongue. We fear that we shall still listen to the affecting story of "*Jack and Gill*" almost with our old feelings of uncontrollable delight, but without troubling ourselves about "*the rector and the lawyer*;"—that we shall hear the touching pathos of "*Hush-a-by Baby on the Tree-top*," without diverging to the interpretation, "*Don't spare them, priest—storm at them in your best style*;" (see p. 270)—and the following catastrophe, however terrible, will not remind us of "*the poor man's call to the cloister, and the wretched condition of the bonded layman*;"—

"As I was going to sell my eggs,
I met a man with bandy legs—
Bandy legs and crooked toes—
I tripp'd up his heels and he fell on his nose."

With Mr. Ker, however, there is "nothing but suffers a Dutch change." By an ingenious turn, the fine philosophical poem about "*the man of Thessaly, who was so wondrous wise*"—almost as wise as Mr. Ker himself—is converted or restored into a pungent satire on the clergy; the domestic history, "*I had a little husband, no bigger than my thumb*," is a severe lesson for the friars; "*Little Tommy Tucker*," and "*Little Bo-peep*," and "*Tuffy the Welchman*," and "*Little Boy Blue*," and "*Charley over the Water*," and "*Goosey, Goosey, Gander*," and "*Hey, diddle, diddle*," and "*Dicory, dicory, dock*," are all stinging lampoons upon the priesthood and their priestcraft. Two specimens we subjoin entire:—

"There was an old woman, and what do you think?
She lived upon nothing but victuals and drink;
Victuals and drink were the chief of her diet,
And yet this old woman could never be quiet.

"Daer wo aen en Onwel-wije-hummend, end wo aet toe die lincke,
Sij luidt op aen nutting Bot. Vied t'els, handterigh!
Vied t'els handterigh! Wie Heer die kijf at haer die laeye heet,
End je wet dies Onwel-wije-hummend keije haer nijver; Bijje quae heet.

"Wherever there is provision in store, there you always find a buzzing chantry [a church establishment]; wherever there are victuals and drink, this always limps after them. The burthen of the chantry song is how to make the most of the clodhoppers; itself an enemy to all handicraft, essentially hostile to all industry in others. As chief

the last twenty or thirty years, it has been prodigiously on the increase,—has this school, with all the freshness of its zeal, and all the ardour of its hopes about it, been able to put down the Roman Catholics; or *has the march of popery actually advanced, as if pari passu, with the march of ultra-protestantism?* Let our readers mark well, and ponder wisely, a note taken from page 151 of this very “Letter.”

“Let any man take the map published by the British Reformation Society, and look at the popish seminaries and chapels there presented to view, in their respective localities through England, Wales, and Scotland; let him look at the progressive increase of them for the last twenty or thirty years, and he will see that popery is growing faster than any two denominations of Christians in the empire.”—p. 151.

Our readers have now, we dare say, had enough of Mr. M’Ghee. Otherwise we might still add many more paragraphs, printed in the closest imitation of the original; as for instance, where, in speaking of the blood of the Redeemer, he denounces—

“The *antichristian* principle that that blood is not sufficient to save us [upper hand], it brazens out those who call it the shark of the community; and you know these buzzing bodies hold honest diligence to be no better than madness [tolly], and that they term the honest labourer, who works for all, rubbish [mean stuff].”

“Toe bed, toe bed,
Says Sleepy-head;
Tarry awhile, says Slow;
Put on the pot.
Says Greedy-gut;
We’ll sup before we go.

“Toe bed, toe bed,
S’ eys Siel hij ‘p je haed;
Toe hare je er u xl S’ eys Louwe;
Put aen de bot,
S’ eys Greytig-guit,
Fiel’s hope behoort wij-e-gauw.

“Harken to the begging one—to the begging one! says the one who has the care of the soul ever in hand—the priest. Hasten to me, says the man of law. Strip the dolt, says the greedy rogue—the parish priest. All a fine blood-sucker has a right to expect must be allowed to be due of the holy sly fox—the priest.

“The *persequende* seems aimed at the three branches of the tonsured profession, viz. the friar, the lawyer, and the regular clergyman, and refers to the share which each takes in the pillage of the countryman’s property. At the end, the regular clergyman is made to say he thinks he is quite rogue enough to be entitled to the whole of the booty, and not to share with such inferior thieves as the other two are, in his eyes.”

Alas! we had always considered this a gem among lyrical productions—a perfect, though brief, example of that very difficult species of composition, the dramatic ode—wonderful for the spirited rapidity of narrative, the nice discrimination of character, and the easy strength of expression, which, we hoped, would not shock the fastidious. Our only consolation is, that if ever some future archaeologist should arise (*eroriare aliquis*) to turn late Mr. Kers’ own sentences into English, he may discover, after all, that the “learned Pundit” was not taken. At present, it seems almost enough to call up poor Persen from his grave, to set it in a false and most unworthy sense of these familiar and homely favourite, which he put into elegant iambs.

without works, and *that works must be added to purchase out salvation.*" —p. 170.

Or where, after quoting the text, "How can they hear without a preacher—and how can they preach, except they be sent," he breaks out—

"And O, alas! alas!! alas!!! my Lord Bishop, what becomes of the case, if those that ought to send, should rather hinder men from going!!!!"—p. 195.

Or where he informs the ignorant, benighted, unfortunate prelate whom he addresses—

"*Licenses to Ministers of Christ to preach the Gospel are an unnatural excrescence on a Christian Church, which are but the proof of some radical disease in her constitution.*"—p. 248.

But we stop. It is needless to dwell upon the arguments of Mr. Mc'Ghee. Their very basis is rotten. He proceeds upon assumptions altogether wrong. He mistakes, or rather forgets, the position of these missionaries from first to last. If men would undertake a warfare, as spiritual crusaders, against the religion of a land, let them go forth, and take the consequences. So went St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles, seeing the bloody crown of martyrdom before their eyes, when the world was overclouded with the darkness of heathenism. So went Wickliffe and Luther, when popery was in the ascendant; so went the illustrious band of our early reformers, not without the presage that they were going to the scaffold or the stake. So, again, went the followers of Wesley and Whitfield in the last century; and so likewise may go the disciples of Irving and Armstrong in our own day. But,—and how essential is the distinction!—they did not go *as part* of the ecclesiastical establishment of the country. They did not go, unsanctioned, uninvited, and perhaps unwelcome, into parishes already occupied by their brethren in the same ministry. The instances, therefore, brought forward by Mr. Mc'Ghee, are either quite beside the purpose, or they tell against himself. The itinerants of "*the Established Church Home Mission*" proceed, we suppose, with auxiliary and tutelary intentions. They go, we suppose, as protectors and allies. Their object, we suppose, is not subversion. But how was it, as we have just seen, with the Apostles and Missionaries of old? *They* went to attack, to shake, to overthrow, to uproot. Well, therefore, might *they* break through the rules, which they would have blushed to acknowledge, and laugh at the discipline, which it was their intention to destroy.

Still less shall we enter upon an elaborate discussion as to canons and statutes—the limits of episcopal authority—and the right of "ordination and jurisdiction." Not that Mr. Mc'Ghee

has made out a case upon any one of these topics. But the matter is really too plain for lengthened inquiry. What, in the name of common sense, what, not merely to the eyes of the Churchman, but to the eyes of the Dissenter, and to the eyes of the Infidel, must be the spectacle of Missionaries, *professedly belonging to a Church*, coming without summons—nay, against the expressed will of its dignitaries,—into places, where ordained Ministers of that Church have been regularly stationed;—neglecting the services of that Church;—for its form of prayers is sacrificed to the discourse of the itinerant preacher;—and throwing slight upon the temples of that Church;—for consecrated, or unconsecrated, ground is made matter of indifference. Why, the whole process—the very appearance of the men—is a libel upon the Church, and a triumph for the enemy; and every fulmination which is hurled against Popery, falls back upon the head of the Establishment, as a charge of inefficiency, and inertness, and uselessness. To our minds, the controversy—if controversy it can be called—between the Bishop of Down and Connor and the contumacious Bachelor of Arts, is decided at once by the obvious and immediate inferences which every rational being must draw. Nothing, if it be interdicted by the Prelate, nothing will authorize this strolling ardour, too often degenerating, by the way, into a mere chace of notoriety, which would not also authorize secession from the Church: and, besides, at a period when men have so many opportunities of making known their opinions through the press as well as from the pulpit, these eccentric and volunteered incursions can have no longer that plea of necessity, which might have justified them in times past.

As matters stand, they are not, and cannot be, justifiable. To what scheme of ecclesiastical polity do such proceedings bear a resemblance? Are they consonant with the spirit or the forms of the Church of England? Are they consistent with the regular action of an ecclesiastical establishment? Have they the *appearance* of conformity, or of dissent? Is soberness of doctrine likely to exist under such circumstance;—is exactness or stability of discipline even possible?

The force, therefore, of the Bishop's objections is untouched, and his positions remain impregnable. Well may his Lordship utter his protest *against the intrusion of unauthorized ministers*; well may he ask—

“Is it not an evil that the parochial Minister, to whom is lawfully committed the government of the Church, and the cure and charge of souls in his parish, should, without his permission, perhaps in defiance of his disapprobation, be molested in his ministrations, that he is to be seduced to give countenance to an unauthorized intruder into his fold,

and become a witness, perhaps a partaker, of the irregularity, or to be forced into a situation of estrangement, perhaps of necessary opposition, to a brother Minister of the Church?"—p. 179, 180.

"Is it not an evil that the character of the paid clergyman of the parish, is to be brought into invidious comparison with the gratuitous and unbought zeal, and the consequently greater sincerity and deeper conviction of the intruder?"—p. 181.

"That his hold upon the good will and affections of his people should *thus* be weakened, his influence among them diminished, and his ministrations depreciated?"—p. 185.

"That his teaching should be gainsaid and vilified, and the sobriety of pastoral and systematic instruction superseded by the rhetorical excitement of an occasional and passing address?"—p. 185.

"Is it not an evil that pulpit should be set up against pulpit—altar against altar? that all notions of Church government and religious union are to be kept out of sight of the people, and that they are to be taught by the example of their intrusive teacher to contravene the Apostle's injunctions, not '*to know them that are over them in the Lord;*' not to '*obey them that have rule over them, and submit themselves;*' but to despise their spiritual rulers, to '*speaking evil of dignities;*' and to '*keep to themselves teachers having itching ears;*'"—187.

"Is it not an evil that instead of remaining content in their own lawful sphere of duty, and setting forth quietness, peace, and love, among all men, and especially among them that are committed to their charge, Ministers of the Gospel should be forsaking their own charge, and wandering abroad, sowing the seeds of necessary disquiet and dissension, among other Christian people in every parish and in every diocese, into which, without authority, they intrude?"—p. 189, 190.

"Is it not an evil thus to cause the body of Christ to be even more and more divided—to propagate and multiply schism—and to assist in causing it to be regarded rather as a matter of indifference than as a prohibited and condemned sin against God, and against the own souls of those who commit it?"—p. 192.

"Is it not an evil that the outward decencies and solemnities of public worship are to be disregarded—that without any preference of consecrated over unholy ground, any place where it is possible to collect a congregation, is to be employed for their ministrations altogether independently of any lawful authority, to appropriate it and sanction its employment for the purpose?"—p. 193.

"Is it not an evil that prayer, the great business of religious assemblies, should be discountenanced, and that the formularies of public worship should be mutilated or abandoned, in defiance of the law which enacts and makes obligatory upon the conscience of every minister of the Church, '*that at all and every time and times, when any sermon or lecture is to be preached, the common prayers and service in and by the book of Common Prayer appointed to be read for that time of the day, shall be openly, publicly, and solemnly read, by some Priest or Deacon in the Church, Chapel, or place of public worship, where the said sermon or lecture is to be preached, and the lecturer then to preach shall be present at the reading thereof;*'"—p. 196, 197.

We have dwelt the longer on these topics, because our bile has been somewhat stirred to see a young man—for, in common charity, we take Mr. M'Ghee's youth for granted—publishing a remonstrance against a bishop of his Church, in answer to a solemn charge delivered by his lordship in his episcopal character, and insisting that his superior is wrong upon many important points of clerical regulation. In kindness to him, and for his future benefit, we would mention a remark, more valuable for the truth which it suggests, than for its particular expressions, which was once made, we believe, on a similar occasion—"A junior officer should at least throw up his commission in the regiment before he calls out his colonel."—But we are not writing an article upon Ireland. That task has been performed in some preceding pages. We would rather direct attention to general principles of Church doctrine and Church government. Unfortunately, England and Scotland, as well as Ireland, are furnishing examples of this Ultra-Protestantism, which is working grievous injury to the Protestant cause. And, in the first place, we must turn, with very considerable regret, to a production of one whom we are very far from mixing up with the common herd of the hot-headed and barking zealots of the day. We allude to a sermon, intitled "*The Divine Patience exhausted through the making void the Divine Law;*" the most emphatic part of its argument being, that the divine patience is exhausted, not by individual crimes, but by legislative enactments; and that it is time for the Lord to work "the work of punishment," because the nation "has made void His law" by the course of its policy. Surely, these are awful assertions for a clergyman to make: surely, this is perilous matter for a clergyman to handle. Wherefore, in taking up the publication, much were we concerned to see the distinguished name of Mr. Henry Melvill in the title-page. It strikes us, too, as neither so original in the conception, nor so fine in the composition, as the generality of his discourses. We are far from agreeing with every thing which Mr. Melvill has asserted; we think him often chargeable with rashness of speculation, inconsistency or uncertainty of doctrine, and overwrought colouring of style: but no one who has heard or read his sermons can deny to him the possession of the highest talents. We regret, therefore, his want of recollection, that there are certain lines, in which men of the highest talents will never stand first; for this simple reason, that they are sure to be out-heroded by persons of more intemperance and less reflection. Among these is the line of political declamations from the pulpit, and fiery descants about the devil and the pope. Such things ought really to be left to the insatiable hunters after popularity, whom we will not even indulge by a mention of their names.

We have no room for a lengthened criticism of Mr. Melvill's harangue. If we could afford the space, we might express an unfeigned sorrow that this celebrated preacher should not rest satisfied with the exhibition and development of the divine attributes as contained in the Scriptures, but should allow himself to say—

“We have often told you that the long-suffering of God is wonderful, because *it indicates the putting constraint on his own attributes; it is omnipotence exerted over the Omnipotent himself.*”—p. 5.

“The grand thing is, that we ascertain a principle in the divine dealings, the principle that there is a register kept of the impieties of a land, and that too with the unerring accuracy of the Omniscient; and that though, as the figures go on rapidly accumulating, God may bear with the land, and ply it with calls to repentance and overtures of forgiveness, yet when those figures present a certain array, they serve as a signal to the ministry of wrath, and mark that there are no sands left in the glass of divine patience.”—p. 12.

“Vengeance is one way in which God works; but it is a way of which we may declare that it is forced upon God, and not resorted to without the greatest reluctance. We find these expressions in the prophecies of Isaiah: ‘The Lord shall rise up as in Mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work, and bring to pass his act, his strange act.’ You observe, the work of wrath is a strange work, and the act of punishment is a strange act. God strikes, *but the striking might almost be declared foreign to his nature*; it is necessary for the vindication of his attributes, but can hardly be said to be *congenial with them*. There is much in this to encourage the penitent, but not the presumptuous. God may be loath to punish, but nevertheless he will punish; and I am only impressed with a greater sense of the tremendousness of divine wrath, when I find that the bringing it into act is *an effort* even to the Omnipotent. *How weighty must that be which God himself has difficulty in raising!*”—pp. 15, 16.

But it is the political spirit of the discourse which we regret to see embellished with Mr. Melvill's oratory, and recommended to imitators by Mr. Melvill's example. It is embodied in passages like these:—

“We have spoken of the desperate jeopardy in which that land would be placed, if its legislature should so abjure the principles of Protestantism as to give countenance and support to the Roman apostacy. It would be time for God to work *in indignation and vengeance*, if a people, whom he hath marvellously delivered from the bondage of Popery, and whom he strengthened to throw off a yoke *which had kept down their immortality*, should give vigour, by any national act, to the corrupt faith of Rome, and thus reanimate *the tyranny which waits but a touch, and it will start again into despotism*. But we know what would be the business of all the righteous in that land, if they saw signs of the approach of such peril. We know that it would not become them to sit in calm expectation of the ruin, comforting themselves with the belief that God

would shelter his own people in the day of indignation. It would be their business to recal the memory of former deliverances, and to bear in mind how God has always chosen extremities, when there seemed least hope that ruin would be averted, for the manifestations of his care over his Church. It would be their business to remember, and to act on the remembrance, that the time for God, in every sense, to work, is the time at which men are making void his law."—p. 20.

"If, indeed, in the land of which we have spoken, a Protestant government were so to sacrifice every principle which enters into its constitution as to make provision for the propagation of Papal falsehood and delusion, we might justly fear that the time for intercession had passed, and that God must hearken to the voice pealing forth from the sepulchres of martyred thousands, and from the souls beneath the altar, *telling him the time was come for him to work as an avenger*. But so long, at least, as the land still held fast his Protestantism, and there was only the threatening of its being surrendered, we should feel that a vast responsibility was laid *upon the men of prayer*, and *upon the women of prayer*, throughout that land. Aye, and we should hope that the days of its happiness and its greatness were not numbered, and that measures, fraught with its desolation, because involving the compromise of its Christianity, would never be permitted to be enacted and enforced, if we knew that these men and these women were urgent in the business of supplication, and that from beneath every roof which gave shelter to God-fearing individuals, in the city, in the village, on the mountain, in the valley, was issuing the cry, 'It is time for thee, Lord, to work as a Protector, for they are making void thy law.'—p. 21, 22.

"'It is time for thee, Lord, to work.'—'They have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword;' and the Judge of men must arise, and vindicate his insulted authority. But I know on whom the mark of deliverance will be set, when the men with the *slaughter-weapons* are commanded to pass through the land."—p. 34.

Still, with many faults of taste, and with some interlocutory addresses to the Divine Being, strange, if not censurable, from their familiarity; as, for instance, "It would be into such a form as this that his reflections would shape themselves—*indeed, Lord*, he hath made void thy law; therefore, as for me, I love thy commandments above gold, yea, above fine gold:"—still, amidst these drawbacks, the sermon has several paragraphs breathing and glowing with high eloquence—the eloquence of reason, the eloquence of imagination, the eloquence of feeling. And hence we but grieve the more that it is disfigured by political allusions, *not*, we think, "*considered with care*," however they may be "*pronounced with fearlessness*." We grieve the more, because we entertain serious apprehensions—nay, we have present evidence,—that others will adopt a similar strain with far inferior discernment, until it almost becomes a fashion with a certain school of clergymen,

"To rave, recite, and madden through the land."

As an elucidation of our remarks, we select one specimen from a multitude before us, although taken, we allow, from a very questionable source. But if—for one evil of such publications is their irresponsibility—we may not fix upon Mr. Cumming all that “*The Pulpit*”^{*} puts into his mouth, our citations may at least stand as a sample of the kind of spiritual instruction with which it is the business of such publications to indoctrinate the realm. We may observe, indeed, that as an excuse for mentioning them, that their natural effect is to circulate every extravagance which attracts notice, and spread that ultraism in religion of which we complain.

The Rev. John Cumming, M. A. preaches a sermon for the British Reformation Society, at the Scottish Church in Crown Court; and takes for his text the awful exhortation in Jeremiah, “*Put yourselves in array against Babylon round about, all ye that bend the bow shoot at her, spare no arrows; for she hath sinned against the Lord.*” The charitable exordium is, “*There can be no question, my Christian Brethren, that Babylon is the type and emblem of the Popish Apostacy;*” and of course, the mild inference is, that all, which, by the special interposition of the divine command, was to be done for the destruction and extermination of Babylon, is to be done for the destruction and extermination of Popery,—and, in *fairness of argument* as deducible from the text, although we, of course, do not suspect the orator of an extent of meaning so atrocious—of the Papists. Not content with the legitimate affirmation of the undeniable truth, that it is a sad and criminal thing in the Church of Rome to refuse or discountenance the free and general perusal of the Scriptures, Mr. Cumming presumes to add,—

“*We do think that this apostacy has herein been guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost; and we are borne out in this awful charge by the fact, that*

* *Quousque tandem abutere, &c.* How long, we may well ask, is Christian patience to be abused? In the brief preface to Mr. Melvill's sermon, we find it declared, “the author would take this opportunity of saying, that he is not responsible for sentiments contained in sermons printed under his name in various periodicals. *It is not only without his consent, but in spite of his repeated remonstrances, that what he preaches is thus continually published, or rather, continually misrepresented.*” And yet, we understand, these devout and most conscientious plunderers have since printed his discourses, as swimmingly, as remorselessly, and in as quick succession as ever. We know of another instance, in which a clergyman delivered a farewell address to a congregation, whom he was about to leave; and during the time of divine service little placards were distributed in the church, announcing that the sermon was to be printed; and, although the clergyman then stated a determination to publish it himself, he was actually anticipated by these people, and frustrated in his intention. And yet they are the religious, *par excellence*. The end is to sanctify the means: and they thus, at the very best, do evil that good may come, living by a pirated piety, and diffusing their evangelical principles by the commission of a palpable theft. When will they listen to the injunction, “*Let him that stole steal no more*?”

to *Babylon* no overture of peace, no promise of mercy is sent in the Scriptures, but threatenings and destinies of blackness and wrath for ever and ever. Adam defaced and marred the pages of the book of creation, which beamed forth the glory, and the majesty, and the goodness of the Almighty ; but popery has mangled and marred the pages of inspiration, which do contain the brightness of the glory of Jesus. Adam sinned against a *creation God*, but popery has sinned against a *revelation God*."—p. 126.

"Popery finds a sphere for every native propensity of man, and withal it pledges a sure reward in eternity. It gives full scope to every depraved desire, and nevertheless holds forth unblushing promise of glory. *It shows how men may live as devils, and die as angels.*"—p. 128.

"You are now to make an *active and aggressive* movement on the battlements of Rome. You are now to open on her heaven's artillery. You are now to urge forward that ploughshare of God's truth, which will turn up her foundations to the withering influences of the winds and rains of heaven. If popery be not actively kept down, it will rapidly spring up. It is a creed indigenous to our nature. This array *commanded in the text*, was formed by the Waldenses, when they dashed like waves of the sea, against the strongholds of popery, and retreated like the same, strewn with the wreck of beauty, and strength, and health. This array was formed by the continental reformers when they sent forth the sound of the glorious gospel which destroyed the walls of Babylon, and razed some of her strongest bulwarks. This array was also formed by the English reformers when from the flames, and from the floods, and from the teeth of the lion, and the fangs of the serpent, they snatched the oracles of inspiration, and opened their blessed pages in the midst of open day ; and it will be a revival of their spirit and their times *if we can prevail on the clergy of the three establishments to preach as becomes them* ON THE FOURTH DAY (SUNDAY) OF OCTOBER, 1835, which is the third centenary of the completion and publication of the first English Bible by Miles Coverdale, on the glorious privileges and blessings of the Reformation. This array was likewise formed by the Scottish reformers, when they so thoroughly rooted out the man of sin from the land, that in 1611 there were but one aged Roman Catholic priest in Scotland, and about ten families professing the popish faith. Thermopylæ, and Marathon, and Trafalgar, and Waterloo, are not meet to be mentioned in the same breath with these glorious triumphs, these embattled arrays of the noble army of reformers ; and the names of Caesar, and Themistocles, and Alexander are not worthy, &c."—p. 129.

"'All ye that bend the bow shoot at her, and spare no arrows.' This appears to me to be the Spirit's call to the ministers of the gospel. It is on them especially that the duty devolves of standing on the watch-towers of Zion, and of taking the lead in all the battles of the Lord. They are to bear forward that consecrated banner, under the inspiration of which are marshalled the saints of the Most High ; and on no account to retreat till they are called from the arena of contest to the victor's laurels and the victor's rest. *Never will the Christianity of our Protestant people rise to its spring-tide strength while the Christianity of our*

Protestant priests continues so low and so superficial. Let us, then, 'spare no arrows!' Let us use all legitimate weapons. These arrows are mentioned in Psalm xlv. 5, 'Thine arrows are sharp in the hearts of the king's enemies.' Some of these are feathered with love, and some with wrath; some are the terrors of the Lord, and others are the mercies of the Lord. We are to take one and all from the armoury of heaven, and whether *they produce plagues* or wound but to save, we are to shoot them against Babylon."—p. 129.

Alas! plagues in abundance they will produce! This is something beyond the "*perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*:" it is almost the very spirit, which, in sterner and darker times, would have subjected a religious opponent to the flames. But Mr. Cumming has not yet exhausted his shafts, or emptied the quiver of his wrath.

"The present crisis calls aloud for active and vigorous efforts. Spare no arrows—support every society that bears upon popery at home, aid and strengthen especially the British Reformation Society, which, in my opinion, is a noble and scriptural array—a glorious phalanx—a *mighty vantage ground from which we may shoot the arrows of the Lord against Babylon*. If we come short in our efforts now, we shall have to lament our neglect, when *Babylon has reared her blasphemous head, diademed with the crowns she has filched from heaven and earth, and drunk with the blood of martyrs*, and rejoicing in the strength and maturity which your apathy and liberalized notions have ministered to her."—p. 130.

The true criterion of such sermons is to be found in the question, with what feelings will those who hear them leave the temple of God? Will it be with gentler tempers? Will it be with holier dispositions? Will it be with that mind of Christ, with that spirit of the gospel, which urges us to "bless and curse not," to love and not persecute? We tremble for our country, when we see these exasperating harangues—the more exasperating, because by no means destitute of a rhetorical ability and power—backed by the machinery of a public association. What good, we ask with a solemn foreboding, what possible good can be accomplished by reviving names and terms which were bandied about in the first fury of the struggle, when men burnt one another, "thinking to do God service?" Will truth be best recommended, or error best encountered and most surely vanquished, by heaping virulent maledictions, unsparing, indiscriminate abuse, upon that religion, which was for centuries the faith of almost the whole of Christian Europe;—the faith of our ancestors, the faith of Pascal, and Fenelon, and Bossuet, and Bellarmine, and Sir Thomas More:—the faith of the monks of St. Bernard, and the sisters of Charity; and which, amidst its melancholy adulterations and corruptions, retains so many of the common elements of orthodox belief? To us at least

it is a frightful image to think of our own forefathers as excommunicated from heaven, and devoted to everlasting perdition!

And what *has been* the effect? If the condition of Ireland is to be evidence, do we find that the cause of Protestantism has been placed upon firmer ground and in a more secure position by the flaming zeal of these its itinerant and self-constituted defenders? Is Popery paralyzed, or weakened, or alarmed? Do we find crowds of converts flocking over to the standard of its adversaries? On the contrary, it is a matter, as we have traced from the documents put forth by the Reformation Society itself, capable of statistical proof, that the greater feebleness of Protestantism, and the more rampant exultation of Popery, have been almost contemporaneous and commensurate with the exertions of this Quixotic itinerancy.

It was hardly possible, in the nature of things, that the result should have been different. Popery will inevitably fall before the spread of education, the general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence, the recognition of the just rights of the human understanding, and the gradual influence of truth, firmly, charitably, temperately asserted. But Popery will not fall before the efforts of men, who contrive to make Protestantism as intolerant and as unreasonable as itself,—of men, who do nothing to convince, and every thing to exacerbate; and whose first care is to issue a mere volley of invectives, at which the blood of a Roman Catholic must boil with a thrilling indignation.

Unless experience is to be altogether thrown away, the past and the present may warn us as to the future. It may be difficult, by any line of conduct, to preserve from decadence and ruin the Protestant establishment in the sister kingdom: but to encourage the designs of these well-intentioned, but most mistaken enthusiasts, is, humanly speaking, to leave it without a chance. They will proceed as a moving tragedy, exciting terror and pity at the same time in the sober-minded members of the community. The regular clergy of our church can scarcely regard them without suspicion: and the Romish priest must look upon them as so many peripatetic incendiaries, while he feels that *he* too may wave his torch, and fling his firebrand. Ay, and from their numbers, and their sway over the populace, the priests may do these things with a ten-fold effect; while they may now be enabled to throw into their most savage attacks, a tone of retaliation and even self-defence. Thus Dr. McHale, the titular Archbishop of Tuam, and one of the most vehement and scurrilous of his order, can find a place, even amidst his account of the destitution and famine of the peasantry, for a sore and choleric attack upon the Protestant church: nor can it be

doubted that, in the struggle, not of reason but of passion, for such, alas, it is, the Papists will have a tremendous advantage, and the Protestants may suffer an irreparable loss. Indeed, unless some arrest is laid upon political and spiritual extravagance, within five years, Protestantism and Protestants may be expelled, or exterminated, throughout the unhappy and almost doomed provinces of Ireland, amidst the most awful scenes of violence and bloodshed.

In England, the chief mischief at present accrues to the Church, in the discredit which fanatics cast upon it by their virulence, and the stabs which they inflict upon it by their slanders. We scarcely ever take up one of their publications without meeting with some truculent libel upon the establishment as it exists. Be Mr. M'Ghee our witness: be Mr. Cumming our witness: be our witness the anonymous author of a precious Pamphlet, styled, "The present Position of Church and State described, the causes assigned, and the remedies proposed by a *Clergyman of the Church of England*."

Let us hear how this "Clergyman of the Church of England" can speak of his brethren. The majority of them he describes, as

"The prelates and clergy and laymen, who entertained what are called HIGH CHURCH sentiments and feelings, with scarcely any doctrine at all, or, what is more lamentable, with DOCTRINES DIRECTLY OPPOSED TO THE FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH, although they call themselves, or are UNRIGHTEOUSLY called, orthodox."—pp. 28, 29.

A note is subjoined, which commences thus,

"WITNESS A HOST OF TRACTS PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, besides volumes of printed sermons, and works, and sermons innumerable delivered weekly by that class of churchmen from the pulpit."—p. 29.

We are moreover informed,

"It is not at all surprising that by the lapse of ages and generations, and the vicissitudes, whether disastrous or beneficial, during the same, that many things which now appear unfair and unequal, should be susceptible of, and greatly need a just and equitable improvement; nor is it surprising that in turning as the nation did from Popery to Protestantism, the many who were only convinced and moved by the abominations the Papists had committed, and not by a change of heart, should like to possess and retain the lucrative offices and places the Papists had created, and that there never should have been a set of men, from that time until now, to PERFECT THE REFORMATION which Cranmer and other martyrs and confessors, it is said, entertained in their hearts.

"THEREFORE is it, that the sincerist indulges in luxury, while the hard-working clergyman is starving in penury. The worldly, fox hunting, and dancing clergymen, and sometimes the godly clergymen

also, because of government and other patronage, are in many instances, holding two or three livings each, or even more preferment; while their curates, who do the work, are frequently not paid the interest for the money spent in their education"—p. 43.

But the "*Clergyman of the Church of England*" is not satisfied with mere general accusations; he rejoices to specify facts and names.

"The writer *dined with two brethren* at Matlock, during the summer that is past, who told him that the dean of Lincoln is taking annually from that and a few of the neighbouring villages, about six thousand pounds a year, though he has not visited those parts for ten years past. One of them was curate in one of these villages, for the whole duties of which he is paid ten shillings a week, or twenty-six pounds the year! He keeps a school to make a living!"—p. 45.

A pleasing sample of the conversation of these gentlemen at or after dinner.

But the "*Clergyman of the Church of England*" flies at higher game than the Dean of Lincoln.

"It has even been currently reported (with what accuracy I cannot tell,) that the Primate of all England has finally resolved and declared, 'that there wants no reform in the church' or 'that he will patronise no reform of the church.' If this be true, the thing is ominous! It will easily be called to mind that the first minister of the crown, after he had proposed and carried the Popish Bill, said in his place, 'I'll have no reform.' Ah! but he had given up his strength like another Sampson, by his spiritual fornication with the HARLOT or BABYLON, and therefore the reform was forced upon him, when his strength being given to the harlot and her friends, he could in nowise stand, but fell, before both it and them."—p. 47, 48.

What wonder, then, is it that the following is the clergyman's deduction; in which, by the way, we have the happiness partly to agree with him:

"*Of the many enemies, who are now raging war against the Church of England, there are none to be compared to those within her pale! It is true to the letter in this case, as our Lord said, that a man's foes shall be they of his own household.* Matt. x. 36.

"*Her true friends are those whose minds are equally balanced.*"—pp. 46, 47.

Our readers will, perhaps, like to see what it is to have a "*mind equally balanced*;" the "*Clergyman of the Church of England*" being himself not merely the commender of that excellence, but "*the great example too*!"

In his production, as the title page signifies to us, the cause of our position is assigned, and the remedy proposed.

"The CAUSE of this trouble or consternation, in both departments, is assigned; and it is proved by facts to be, the abolition of all Christian tests, and the admission of Roman Catholics and Infidels, as such, to the Commons house of Parliament."—p. 65.

"The REMEDY proposed, therefore, is, *the retracing of those steps which have led us into so great difficulty*; in other words, the *repealing* of those measures which broke down, which unchristianized and unprotestantized, the constitution."—p. 66.

Now, upon these matters, we confess, very much might be said. But discretion tells us, that, in our actual circumstances, it is idle to open afresh the wounds which we cannot heal. What is past, is past; and for ourselves we would always be the more careful what we concede, because we believe that concession in general is almost from its very nature irrevocable. Power, when once abdicated, can scarcely ever be resumed. At any rate, insults are not arguments. *Cui bono*, then, such paragraphs as these?

"What an accession was made to the Commons House of Parliament by thus opening the doors to *lewd fellows of the baser sort*! (Acts xvii. 5.) of whom it is nothing but truth to say, that, on subjects the most serious and awful, again and again have some of them systematically laughed and ridiculed."—p. 7.

"No longer countenance to that hot-bed of sedition and lies, 'Maynooth,' can be given; but it must be abandoned, or levelled with the ground—not hurting a hair of any man's head, but only checking the means of vending poison and desolation to the souls of the king's subjects."—p. 70.

"Now, my dear Christian and Protestant brethren, who are lovers of your country, your religion, and your God, consider what I say, and the Lord give you understanding in all things! Is it that you desire to promote *temperance, sobriety, and chastity*, among your fellow-subjects? Tell me, how shall you really do so, if you set not your faces against *Popery, the parent of licentiousness*, and against infidelity, which is the enemy of all godliness and the betrayer of all virtue, in the higher places of the state as well as in the lower places of society? In other words, tell me, what can you do without the REMEDY proposed." p. 74.

But although "the first genuine conservative measure, and without which all others will be found ineffective and useless, will be THE REPEAL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL—"I know what I say, and whereof I affirm,"—still this is by no means all.

"The Church can neither be preserved nor reformed *until first the repeal of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill is proposed, and supported,*

and carried. If this cannot be done, then the only hope of safety to the Church is *her severation* from such a state, the revival of the convocation of her clergy, and the honest and earnest setting about her own reform—a reform which her heads can only devise and righteously effect, by giving diligent and affectionate heed to the testimony of *her laborious servants*, and the necessities of her destitute people in all parts.”—pp. 48, 49.

For this purpose an unlimited multiplication of proprietary chapels is advised, that the principles of the Voluntary System may be sown, *broad-cast*, in the very midst of the Establishment; “*in accordance*,” perhaps, “*with the sentiments and feelings of Nonconformists, of blessed memory*.”

“The power to do so great benefits has not been with ‘the Body,’ the Church,” headed or subscribed with the approval of the bishop, or ordinary; but a *preventing* power has been vested with every individual incumbent.”—p. 50.

Hinc lachrymæ! And hereupon “the Clergyman of the Church of England” has recourse again to his personalities, and relates a story, the *literal* truth of which we must beg leave to doubt:—

“It is but the other day that a clergyman (whose testimonial was signed by three of the London clergy, not inferior, touching reputation, to any, and with which the bishop was perfectly satisfied, for indeed this clergyman then held his lordship’s license to a chapel in London) was resisted by an incumbent, and finally ejected, and the chapel doors were shut; and they are now only re-opened upon the minister who serves consenting to and signing a bond of that incumbent’s dictation, ‘that he will not visit in sickness, even during the absence of the incumbent or his curate, the members of the congregation to whom he ministers every Lord’s day, on pain of forfeiting TWO THOUSAND POUNDS.’—pp. 52, 53.

Moreover,

“There are also instances of ministers and their congregations being prevented joining the communion of the Established Church by incumbents. One occurred about two years ago at Reading, when a pious and excellent man, with his large and influential congregation, desired to be united, and with the entire approbation of the bishop of the diocese; but which was effectually prevented by the unreasonable demands of the incumbent, which rendered the same impossible.”—p. 51.

May we not submit this account to the notice of a poet and divine who has lately been promoted by Sir Robert Peel?

“The Clergyman of the Church of England” has the additional honour of being a correspondent of some newspaper called “*The*

Record;" and writes, it would appear, as the organ and representative of a body.

"Mr. Editor,—After a *providential*, and not a concerted interchange of thoughts, between a number of clerical and lay brethren, it devolves on me to request in their behalf, though for an object far more important, that you will give publicity to an opinion in which they all concur.

"It is their decided conviction, that peace and safety to the Protestant establishments of England, Ireland, and Scotland, can never more be insured, so long as a Roman Catholic is found in their legislative assemblies."—pp. 39, 40.

In another of his letters to the same paper, he praises the lucubrations of the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee—for it must be owned that these gentlemen never desert one another, but preserve the closest connexion—and seems equally alarmed with the worthy A.B., lest "the nation, being wilfully and obstinately marked on the forehead with the Papal and Infidel beast, become desolate, afflicted, ruined, destroyed, smitten of God, accursed!" (p. 42), and "*from the heaven of her privileges should be thrust down to hell.*"—p. 77.

In this letter he first asks, "Is there not a cause? If I may use a figure, is *there not a Jonah in the vessel?*" and then, having ascertained the fact, begs to inquire "whether the Jonah in the vessel, which we feel and know to be in imminent danger, be not certain *dignitaries in Church and State?*"—p. 22.

But we are sick of such diatribes. However, as the author has favoured us with a note, requesting our opinion of his pamphlet, and pointing out particular passages in which its sentiments are condensed, we are constrained to inform him that it strikes us as a farrago of pestiferous rubbish; and that we dislike it the more for the very injudicious, and improper, and almost profane, admixture of scriptural expressions and allusions.

The worst is, that we are thrown upon a crisis, when zeal *must be ruinous* without prudence, and even mere folly has the power of doing much harm. We know that we are on delicate ground; but we are careful to advance no statement which we could not substantiate by almost countless quotations. There are clouds and storms of disaster hanging over us, not merely from the enmity of Dissenters and Roman Catholics; but from the Ultraism of men who are not contented with the doctrinal state of their own Church. From the ranks of these men a loud and general outcry has been raised against the false or impoverished theology of the mass of the Established Clergy—a loud and general outcry has been raised, that they have not been true ministers of God or faithful exponents of the Gospel—a loud and general outcry has been raised, that "*the Protestant Reform-*

ation is incomplete." Alas! if it is to be completed by such men as Mr. M'Ghee and his friends, we can anticipate too well what will become of the Church of England!—if it is to be completed by a blind impetuosity in politics, joined with a shallow exclusiveness in religion, by absurd and angry statesmanship blended with rash and partial divinity. Alas! we discern in men like these no sobriety, no evenness of mind; we discern nothing steady, nothing well-balanced; we discern nothing of the firm and moderate caution by which our Church has been distinguished. We see little more than painful oscillations between intemperance and fear. Thus, on the one side, we are beset by theorists who would amalgamate in the same nominal Establishment professors of the most opposite principles—Papists, Protestants, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents—perhaps Socinians and Unitarians; on the other side, by enthusiasts, who, if others are unwilling to walk upon their peculiar causeway of dogmatism and phraseology—a causeway well-nigh as narrow as the bridge of Al Sirat—would almost deny them to be fellow-Christians, or capable of salvation. The worst, however, is, that the conduct of these latter persons is as inconsistent, as it is violent. In one hour, they are fraternizing with the Methodists; in another, they are pealing their tocsin against Nonconformity;—in one hour they are thundering anathemas against the Papists; in the next, they are virtually aiding the seceders and self-conceited philosophers, who would tell us that the science of government is exploding the barbarous doctrine of Ecclesiastical Establishments, and who, in the present state of public opinion, are far more to be dreaded than the Roman Catholics:—so that these railing polemics scarcely ever strike a blow, without managing, either by accident or design, to wound the Church and its orthodoxy as they brandish their weapons.

And the irreligious portion of the community, the Nonconforming congregations, the opponents of the Church in general—do they not all rejoice in these things? They rejoice with a mighty and undissembled joy. Do they not take advantage of these attacks? We will give one instance, out of the hundred which we might bring forward, of the advantage which they have taken. Before us is a slight pamphlet, consisting of two letters reprinted from the *Morning Chronicle* newspaper. The second of these letters, on the *Voluntary Principle*, addresses itself, with an *argumentum ad homines*, to the Evangelical Clergy:—

"I am not, you will observe, expressing any opinion on the abstract question of the necessity or possible advantage of a religious Establishment, but commenting on the actual Church Establishment of this country. Now, then, I would say to you, with deference, take an

impartial view of the English Church, through a duration of nearly two centuries, and at the present time. You well know that, with all its amplitude of powers and means—its many thousands of consecrated teachers, of all degrees—its occupancy of the whole country—its prescriptive hold on the people's veneration—its learning, its emoluments, and its intimate connection with all that was powerful in the state—it did, through successive generations, leave the bulk of the population, for whose spiritual benefit it was appointed, in the profoundest ignorance of what *you* consider as the only genuine Christianity.”—pp. 20, 21.

“You gladly retreat from this point of review, and take your stand on the present state of the Church, in which you say that a better spirit is at last arising; and therefore you would regard its supposed fall as a dreadful calamity, involving little less than ruin to the cause of religion in the land. By this better spirit, I must understand you to mean that many ministers like yourselves are appearing in the Church who inculcate religion in that form which has fixed on you and them, for praise and opprobrium, the distinctive epithet *Evangelical*. I believe you all insist on the vast importance of exhibiting religion in that form; *declaring the doctrines so distinguished to be of the very essence and vitality of Christianity; insomuch that the contradiction or suppression of them radically vitiates a minister's religious teaching.* But now let me remind you what a small minority, notwithstanding all the recent accessions, you form of the ministers of the Church; and seriously ask you what you can deliberately think of the principle and tendency of an institution under the appointment and sanction of which, perhaps, six-sevenths or more of the religious instructors are, as in your judgment they must be, misleading the people in respect to infinitely the most momentous of their concerns. Are you never, in your pulpits, when solemnly enforcing the Evangelical principles, intruded upon by the image of the many thousands of congregations listening, at that very hour, to doctrines virtually or avowedly opposite to yours, in churches which they attend in the undoubting confidence that the religious ministration in an institution sanctioned by venerable antiquity, and all the authority of the realm, must be right? On retiring, you have to strike the balance between the good and evil effected on the selfsame Sunday by the institution which you extol.”—pp. 22, 23.

“But you, even you, with *all your sorrow that the Establishment is fatally treacherous to its momentous trust*, are still more zealous for its permanence, in the professed hope that the Church, which should all this while have been converting the people, may at length be itself converted. Strange idea, methinks!”—p. 28.

“What will you be thinking, all the while, of the contrary and counteracting effect of the *spiritually dead* condition (your own phrase) of the *un-evangelized* portion of the Church, which will for a long time, at all events, retain you in the hapless condition of the captives of Mezentius?”—p. 30.

“On such a survey of the Ecclesiastical system, I hope you will pardon an old observer *for presuming to dissuade you of the evangelical*

party from joining chorus in the language which profanely affects to identify the fate of Christianity with the stability or fall of an institution which, by your own declaration, unites the Monichean principles—but without their equality.”—p. 31.

Comment must be superfluous. The inferences will suggest themselves.

Even as we write, we see a meeting announced for the 20th of June, at Exeter Hall, where the Rev. Robert M'Ghee and the rest of the fraternity, are to explain the true principles of Popery to “*Protestants of all denominations* ;” and where, we suppose, a grand confederacy is to be formed of the foes of the Papal Antichrist, the Church of England being merged in the general mass, as one sect among many. This smaller evil, however, must be borne ; so that the provincial actors may have the opportunity to come *starring* upon the London boards ;—starring, yet not content to shed a tranquil light as fixed constellations ; but preferring to travel about as erratic planets ; or blaze, like fiery comets, big with trouble and change*.

We call this spirit *Ultra-Protestant*, as a designation much more appropriate than evangelical ; since we look in vain for any real conformity to the temper of the Gospel ; and we would fain believe that the heads of the evangelical party in England are ready to disclaim it. And, in fact, it is the activity of hatred with which men start away from Popery, which makes them overleap the truth. There is to be no medium. Popery is wrong—such appears to be the mode of argumentation—Popery is wrong : therefore, that which is the farthest removed from Popery must be right. The conception never seems to enter within the scope of this strange philosophy, that one extreme may be as erroneous and as pernicious as another.

Yet if these extremities prevail, the man in the United Kingdom, who will have most reason to rejoice, is Mr. O'Connell. The effect of such mistaken policy is, in Ireland, to play into the hands of priests and demagogues ; and, in England, if its career

* Since our remarks were written we have seen several accounts of this meeting as having actually taken place. It appears to have turned out much as we anticipated—a thing of boisterous confusion, heated declamation, and idle challenge—that is, idle in England, but terrible in Ireland. The speakers, we believe, were all Irish or Scotch ; and will they derive no lesson from the non-attendance of persons, who, in more judicious measures, would be happy to support them ? What a pity it is, we must repeat, that these men are so eloquent ! Their oratory is their snare ; and every trope is a misfortune. Have they no duties at home ? Alas, what good can there be, in attempting to create in England the same fever of agitation, which is burning in the sister kingdom with so intense and delirious a rage ? We cannot but think—while the common and legitimate channels of expressing opinion are all open and at hand—that such meetings are calculated to do serious mischief, although some excellent persons might be present, and so respectable a nobleman as Lord Kenyon might preside.

be unimpeded, to unhinge the whole frame of our ecclesiastical constitution. In such a state of things, we can foresee, for the Church, only schism and calamity; for the empire, only dismemberment and decay; for the people, only discords and convulsions; and for individuals, only the loss of true religion, absorbed in the scorching heat of feuds and controversies. Like begets like: violence is the parent of violence. The rancorous and factious turbulence of the Romish Priests inflames the rage of their opponents, and is inflamed by the almost equal rancour of those opponents in its turn. And if the animosity of the Priests is embittered, we cannot marvel that the fierceness of a subservient multitude should not be softened and civilized by the thriftless prodigality of insults and contumelies lavished upon their creed.

In short, we are, as we have ever been, ardent and earnest friends to the principles of the Reformation, ready to do all and sacrifice all for their maintenance; but we would have Roman Catholics and Protestants treat each other as fellow-men and fellow-citizens, not hunt each other like wolves. We regard the system of the Papacy as politically despotic and spiritually perilous, and, when developed in its worst shape, as under both aspects baneful and destructive; but, for that reason, we the more lament the ebullitions of Messrs. Cumming and M'Ghee, and decry the course which such men are pursuing. We wish to see the Roman Catholics converted to a purer faith: this, however, is not to convert, but to irritate. We wish to see Protestantism triumphant: this, however, is not to crown it with triumph, but to render it odious. We wish to see our institutions unimpaired and inviolate: this, however, is not to preserve, but endanger, to bring our establishments into disrepute, and to throw the most painful embarrassments in the way of our conservative statesmen. Would that these enthusiasts could take a lesson from Mr. Blunt, of Chelsea, where, in a sermon appended to his discourses on the doctrinal articles,—a sermon firmly defending the Church, without judging or maligning its opponents,—he says:—

“In the disputes which have latterly agitated, and are at present agitating, in so violent a manner, both Dissenters and Churchmen, I have taken no part. The subject has never been, however distantly, alluded to from this place—first, because I have always felt that the plain and simple topics of Scriptural instruction afford sufficient, and far more than sufficient, occupation for these brief and hallowed opportunities; and that if, during the week, the minds of men are exercised, as they must ever be in this great metropolis, in the toils of labour, or the vicissitudes of trade, or the anxieties of professional duties, or the conflict of political opinions, the Sabbath ought to be a day of mental repose, as well as of bodily rest; that no harassing or irritating topics

should ever be permitted to interrupt its hallowed hours ; and that, above all, no subject, no word, no thought, should cross the mind, while in the house of God, which does not, as the word of God expresses it, ‘ make for peace.’ ”—p. 234.

“ It is unnecessary, we hope, to add, that nothing which shall be spoken on the present occasion shall be in any degree at variance with feelings such as these ; that called upon, as I conceive myself to be, by the passing events around us, to endeavour to defend the Church, of which I am a very humble, but attached and devoted member, I obey the call, with the fullest conviction that ‘ the weapons of our warfare are not carnal ;’ that unless we bring to the task a really charitable feeling towards those who differ from us, and an earnest desire to avoid all fierce, and angry, and bitter controversy, the God whom we serve will withhold His blessing, and we shall run and labour in vain.”—p. 236.

We are glad to borrow these quotations on several accounts ; more especially, as their introduction may serve for another testimony, that we would not confound with the fanatics of the hour the able and excellent men who adorn the evangelical party in the Church, although there may be points of difference between that party and ourselves. We would rather call upon them to use their influence in a case where our exhortations would be wasted. We would call upon them to impress upon zealots, who are dealing about fury and condemnation, “ that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God :” to impress upon enthusiasm that, in religion, as in all other matters, extremes meet ; and that the superstitions of Solididianism may be found closely bordering upon the superstitions of Popery ; inasmuch as it matters little, in the effect upon public morality, whether a criminal may receive absolution from the priest, or an atrocious murderer may go with holy rapture to the gallows, as assured of pardon and reward, as if his whole life had been irreproachable. We would call upon them to urge, that there is no inconsistency in asserting both justification by faith and the necessity of good works ; to inculcate a sound comprehensiveness of doctrine, and a courageous meekness of demeanour ; but, most of all, to assist in driving back those billows of turbid folly and boisterous violence,—half filth, half froth,—which may otherwise overwhelm every landmark of pure and rational belief, and in saving the Church from distraction and overthrow, by presenting it with a front towards its adversaries, bold and yet calm, intrepid and yet gentle, prepared to meet and vanquish all its difficulties by a prudent vigour and a tranquil magnanimity.

ART. IX.—1. *Abstract of Education Inquiry.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20th March, 1835.

2. *Resolutions respecting Education.* Ordered to be printed by the House of Lords, 21st May, 1835.

3. *The Speech of Henry Lord Brougham, in the House of Lords, on Thursday, May 21, 1835, on the Education of the People.*

THE document which stands at the head of this article, we may venture to say, is the most important of its kind which has ever appeared. And, certainly, its introduction to the public is at least as extraordinary as the thing itself. It has had the honour of being proposed as the basis of a great legislative measure, before it has been completely submitted to the inspection even of the senators on whose voice the measure is to depend. Literally speaking, while two-thirds of the *Abstract* only were printed, while the concluding and explanatory observations of the compiler upon his own work were shut up in his own breast, a learned and noble peer moved certain resolutions in the upper house of Parliament, which rested mainly for their value and their truth upon the *Abstract* of the education returns, an important part of which were still in the press; and we understand that he has given notice that he shall proceed with the business forthwith, i. e. before they can be complete.

This extraordinary velocity of proceeding in legislative measures has been adopted on more than one occasion in modern times; and though we protest against *the pace* as dangerous in the extreme, and would fain see the old *drag-chain* a little more in use, we have not the indiscretion to cry out and increase the danger by making a noise, provided *the vehicle is all right*. But when we find that its materials are of an inferior kind, picked and patched up hastily and carelessly from any shop,—that many of the screws and bolts and stays are altogether away,—that the roughness and impediments of the road are to be completely set at nought,—in fact, that (although it is said, “let us keep to the old way! nothing can work better than things have hitherto done,”) a new line of road is to be taken which nobody has tried before;—and, moreover, that the driver intends to maintain, or rather to increase, the rate at which he goes, then, at all hazards of provoking his anger and incurring a thousand other risks, we must call out, and catch hold of the reins, and resist such a course of proceeding to the utmost of our power.

But we are writing in sad and sober earnest. The *Abstract* is a most important document, though far from what we had expected and from what it ought to have been;—and the conclusions

which have been derived from it, and printed for the information of the House of Lords are injudicious and erroneous in the extreme—just what might be anticipated from the haste in which they have been formed.

The abstract is the result of a motion made by the Earl of Kerry in May, 1833, requiring returns on the state of education in England and Wales. The measure was delayed at first on the score of expense, and only undertaken by Lord Melbourne, in the following autumn, on being told by Mr. Richman that he would superintend the whole business without expecting any personal remuneration. The questions were then immediately issued to all the overseers in the kingdom, with duplicate copies (sometimes amounting to 100 or even more for the most populous places) to be handed over by them to the several schoolmasters for making and signing their own returns.

The very numerous subjects embraced in the inquiry can only be understood from the address itself:—

“ A return of the number of schools in each town, parish, chapelry, or extra-parochial place; which return, after stating the amount of the population of the said town or place according to the last census, shall specify;—1. Whether the said schools are infant, daily, or Sunday schools;—2. Whether they are confined, either nominally or virtually, to the use of children of the Established Church, or of any other religious denomination;—3. Whether they are endowed or unendowed;—4. By what funds they are supported, if unendowed, whether by payments from the scholars or otherwise;—5. The numbers and sexes of the scholars in each school;—6. The age at which the children generally enter, and at which they generally quit school;—7. The salaries and other emoluments allowed to the masters or mistresses in each school;—and shall also distinguish,—8. Those schools which have been established or revived since 1818;—and, 9. Those schools to which a lending library is attached.”

In making the abstract, our readers may be surprised to know that *all schools* in which the children *do not remain after seven years of age* are classed as INFANT SCHOOLS, whether supported by the parents, as village dame-schools, &c. or under the superior plan of what are called, *par excellence*, infant schools; no distinction is to be perceived in this class, except what may be derived, by way of inference, from (4), under which some account and classification of payments has been obtained. *Daily* schools are determined also by *the age at which children leave*, viz. fourteen; and these comprise children from two or three to any age between seven and fourteen. So that an infant school, which children leave at eight, is termed a *daily* school; and under this head an attempt is made to comprise, not merely schools for the working classes, but every species of academy from King's College and the London University down to that description of school

which affords instruction of the humblest kind;—from the Latin and Greek and science of a school at 100*l.* a year, to the institution which is composed of fifteen or sixteen little folk (decked out in curls and finery, which they are not allowed to wear in any well-conducted public or national school,) ranged in rows all day upon two or three little forms, learning *their* A. B. C., and to be *pretty behaved*;—in one of which, we remember, the governess once told us, concerning a working man's child, that “miss was a pretty scholar and now able to read *her Galatians*!” These noble seminaries of polite literature, with colleges, grammar, boarding, national, Lancastrian and preparatory schools of every description, are comprised under the division entitled “daily schools.” *Sunday* schools stand apart;—but unfortunately there are no data for determining whether the same children are comprised under the heading SUNDAY, as well as under that of DAILY schools; and this we hold to be a cardinal defect in the inquiry. In some few cases the writers of the returns have of their own accord furnished the explanation which ought to have been required of them all; and of these the compiler has carefully availed himself, so as to reduce as far as possible the uncertain extent of the duplicate entry; but what he has been able to do is nothing in the account, and the public remain where they were some years ago, notwithstanding the expense and labour which have been incurred; they are still (after this the second public inquiry) in ignorance as to the actual number of children receiving instruction. There is not, indeed, any confusion or any duplicate entry occasioned by the returns from *infant* and *daily* schools; and so far it is well; but, in as much as the *Sunday* scholars are more than equal to the number of daily scholars, and (as we shall hereafter show) in consequence of the nature of certain districts, *Sunday* instruction is in every point of view at least as important as that given in other districts through the whole week, we are really left by the abstract in ignorance as to the very matter which we hoped to have ascertained. The total number of children receiving education throughout England only is somewhere between 1,548,890 (*Sunday* scholars), and 2,825,837 (*Sunday* scholars and daily scholars together), less or more, according to the proportion in which the daily scholars are or are not comprised in the *Sunday* schools; but these duplicate returns are only shown to exist in the case of a few children who belong to *Sunday* and *daily* schools (being one and the same institutions), and are entered and repeated in each class.

In offering these remarks upon this branch of the inquiry and other departments which will necessarily come into notice as this article proceeds, we wish to be clearly understood. Nothing can

be more satisfactory than the information which has been derived from the returns;—few things have lately come under our notice more *unsatisfactory* than the questions by which those returns were obtained. When we first looked into the subject we were forcibly reminded of a passage which we had hoped would have for ever put an end to such careless and unstatesman-like work. We cannot believe that the *questions* were ever drawn up by the able and gratuitous compiler of the abstract, or by the author of the following remark:—

“This address for returns to Parliament is here mentioned (*Preface to the Population Abstract*, 1833, vol. i. p. xviii.) as an example *not* fit to be imitated in future, the terms of it being so vague, &c. The different versions of the meaning of the Address were perhaps inevitable (by those who replied to it); *but in any case to circulate questions unaccompanied by a printed formula, whereby to insure uniform answers, can only obtain a vague, or at best, an unmanageable return. The expense incurred, &c.*”

Thus much, in a general way, for the Abstract;—we feel bound to offer a few remarks in justification of the charge which we have made against the noble mover of the fourteen Resolutions, before we proceed to examine the substance of what he desires to have invested with the authority of law.

In the first place, when we took up the resolutions, we were forcibly struck at the general carelessness of the expressions in which they are put forth. We were not disposed to be over-nice in this matter; but such a specimen of tautology as the following, from so great a master of the English language, did, we thought, betoken undue haste;—resolution 2 . . . *the kind of education given at the schools . . . is of a kind* by no means sufficient for the instruction, &c.” We find, indeed, that Lord Brougham, in his published speech, has blotted out the glaring repetition of terms which was submitted to the House of Peers, and *which still remains in the paper printed by their Lordships’ authority*; but the luminous opposition between education and instruction still remains, and though it is the education of the people which is condemned in resolution 2, and their instruction which is desired, yet it is, after all, in resolution 6, their education which is to be improved and made all that can be wished. The tautology betokened haste, and the imperfect correction demonstrates that undue haste has been used. There are many other inaccuracies very apparent to those who understand scholastic affairs. Then, the order, or rather disorder, of the six first resolutions, surprised us much;—the *first*, the *third*, and the *fifth* resolutions relate to the deficiency of schools; the *second* and *sixth* to the insufficiency of what is taught in them; and in the midst of these stands the

fourth, declaring the great principle of non-interference with existing schemes. When we looked into the speech, which served as a comment upon the resolutions,—the speech itself, discursive as it was, appeared clear and well-digested in comparison of what is here described. We read, page 9—

“I say, then, first, that the schools are still too few in number; secondly, that they are confined to children of an age too advanced; and, lastly, that they give a kind of instruction exceedingly scanty and imperfect. I am prepared to demonstrate these three propositions by facts which are within the knowledge of many of your Lordships, and would be known to you all, if you deemed the subject of sufficient importance to fix your attention.”

All this, and all that followed from it, was orderly enough, and we were led to conclude that certainly the resolutions must have been written out in haste, and that the substance of them was digested and arranged in his lordship's mind as he proceeded to the House.

Two other points especially struck us as evincing signs of an undue want of thought. We were surprised that, while Lord Brougham dwelt so forcibly upon the deficiency of schools in the larger towns, he should have no compassion upon places which had not any schools at all. We remembered a very impressive speech from his Lordship in March, 1834, in which he maintained the urgent want of schools, and said that, in respect of *two kinds of places*, his assertion was especially true:—

“The first had reference to very small parishes or places. He believed that there were in the country not fewer than 1500 such at that moment without any day-school. The other and more important defect of education, to which he wished shortly to call the attention of the house, was one which could not be too much deplored, nor could it be too speedily dealt with, in order to remedy the evil. He meant the case of large towns.”

Now, we had heard from the annual report of the National Society (delivered to the public upon 20th May), that by a calculation founded on the two first volumes of the Abstract, it was lamentably true that there were above 2000 places (small parishes, chapeltries, townships, and extra-parochial spots.) which were without any school at all. The report grounded upon this fact an earnest appeal to the nation to co-operate in the good work in which the committee were engaged. But it seemed to us very strange that the Abstract should have been submitted, even for an hour, to his Lordship's keen eye, and yet that he should have given up an argument which that document showed to possess at least one-third more power than he had ever sup-

posed. We inferred, and subsequent reflection has convinced us we were right, that Lord Brougham had hardly looked into the two volumes at all, except, perhaps, to take out the numbers; as we also felt persuaded, on a mere glance at the 5th resolution, that he had never duly considered the proceedings of the Treasury in respect of the parliamentary grants during the two last years. *Our hasty* and instantaneous reasoning ran thus:—"What! parliament give *separate* encouragement for infant schools! Is his Lordship then ignorant of the Treasury minute of 30th August, 1833? Is not he aware that the terms of the vote were most general—" *Schools for the education of the children of the poorer classes?*"—and that neither in the acts of the two sessions, nor in the Treasury minute, is there any reference whatever to the scholar's age! Has he never seen the National Society's Report! How careless of its conductors not to put a copy in his Lordship's hands; and how unfortunate that his Lordship never thought of an institution which possesses the confidence of all the great educationists in the country, and is in communication with schools containing above a million children. He might at once have read, p. 10 Report for 1834:—"

"Hence, while every variety of arrangement for the instruction of poor children, whether under male or female teachers, has been encouraged as far as possible during the last twelve months, three kind of schools may be particularly distinguished in the list of applications which have either been transmitted to the Lords of the Treasury for assistance, or aided to a limited extent out of the funds of the National Society, viz. *Schools for Infants* under 6 or 7 years of age; *Sunday and Daily Schools* for children from 6 or 7 to about 13; and *Sunday Schools*, chiefly for those who have passed through the other institutions, and are engaged in labour during the week, the evening being the only time, except on the Lord's Day, when they can profit by the school. And, it is satisfactory to the Committee to add, that schools of the first and last-mentioned class have been frequently combined, so that the rooms, which are filled with infants during the week, will serve for elder scholars on the Sundays; and thus, when the plan is completely matured, twice the number of children will receive instruction in the school-rooms which they are calculated to hold at one and the same time."

His Lordship must have heard it mentioned, as Chairman at the British and Foreign School Society's Meeting this year, that the National Society had got above 13,000*l.* appropriated by a Whig government towards their schools, while the institution in which he was chiefly interested had only got rather more than 6000*l.* Did he not think it worth while to ask how this larger proportion of the public money had been employed? His Lordship might have heard, if he asked at the Treasury, that while (after this grant) the unsatisfied claims of the Lancastrian schools

amounted to 6,196*l.* for 9,100 scholars, the claims of the National schools were no less than 19,170*l.* for 28,410 scholars! Was it not worth while to ask what this meant? But whether it was so or not, no doubt remained on our minds that Lord Brougham was in ignorance of the educational business which had been transacting for some time at the Treasury. He never could mean that there should be encouragement to schools in general, comprising infant schools, and to infant schools in particular, distinct from the rest. With surprise, therefore, we yielded to our conviction in this respect; and we certainly thought it wrong, and unstatesmanlike, and not in keeping with the boasting exordium of the speech, that his Lordship should come forward to recommend a set of *legislative resolutions* to the country without some inquiry, which he might have made (and indeed without much trouble) into such matters as these.

We lament to state that all our deliberations upon the subject have only tended to confirm our first impressions. We cannot follow out the resolutions according to the order in which they stand; but we will take them as nearly as possible in this order, classing our remarks under the four different heads to which they relate; viz. I. Resolutions 1, 3, 5, On the deficiencies in the means of education, comprising the four heads—*Increase* and *Extent* of Schools, *Unequal Distribution* of Schools, and *Infant* Schools; II. Resolutions 2 and 6, On the kind of instruction given in the schools, and the means of improving it; III. Resolution 4, On the principle of non-interference; which last is, however, intimately connected with IV. Resolutions 7 to 14, On charitable endowments, and the means contemplated in order to a more beneficial application of such funds.

Lord Brougham commenced with laying vast stress upon the *increase* of schools; and since he spoke of "*demonstration by facts*," we looked into the documents existing on the subject with a sense of dissatisfaction at our stupidity in having formed a conclusion widely different from his. Not that we doubted the increase of schools; but we were convinced that it had not taken place in England to the extent of 647,034 daily scholars, and 974,634 Sunday scholars, as stated in the education abstract. We had all along surveyed the matter with impressions such as these, that "the digest of the Education Committee, in 1818, was "got up in a hasty manner, and not with the same deliberate care "as the present abstract;—that the inquiry on which it was "formed was made with a view principally to the charitable endowments (against which *in that day* the wrath of the chairman "of the committee was so hot), whereas the inquiry for the abstract "was made simply and deliberately with reference to numbers,

“ and not to this particular class of schools ;—that the former inquiry was made through the clergy only ; the latter, by help of the “ overseers, but through the schoolmasters themselves.” And from this last circumstance it appeared to us conclusive that the difference between the digest and the abstract did not show the actual increase of schools. The clergy, indeed, performed their work on the former occasion faithfully and completely ; the chairman testified (Third Report of Committee, June, 1818, (426) page 55,) that “ it was impossible to bestow too much commendation upon the alacrity shown by those reverend persons in “ complying with the requisition, and the honest zeal which they “ displayed, &c.” But, with zeal they had discretion, we supposed ; and it was hardly probable that they would go into every dissenting school, and into every little lodging-room in which a day-school was advertised upon a board, or meddle with private institutions of a higher kind ; and it was certain they would not exaggerate the amount of schools. But overseers, in their earnestness, might do the first ; and, in fact, to save themselves from all charge of partiality, must do so. (We have heard complaints uttered in much bitterness where they did not send a paper of questions.) And then, as to exaggeration of numbers, the abstract itself bears witness that this has taken place. In the vast town of Liverpool, for instance, where the overseers have been particularly active, they state that much delusion will arise from this cause, viz. the overstatements of parties who give account of *their own* schools. In fact, what petty schoolmaster, whose notions of veracity do not rise very far above the standard of the world, will acknowledge that his school has fallen off ? Either names of children who have left are kept on the list, or round numbers are used, as *about* 50 for 37 or 38, &c. &c. ; but certain it is that there is a strong tendency to exaggeration whenever mankind are allowed to give an account of themselves. For all these reasons, our conclusion was different from that which is made the basis of Lord Brougham’s speech. And when we read that he would spare the house the entering into details, that he would lay before them results, that he would only state facts, we felt that he took great responsibility on himself ; but no doubt he was right ; he could hardly say so much, unless he was speaking from book. What then was our amazement, when, on turning to the digest of 1818, we read the following remarks, drawn up by the chairman of the committee, no doubt, and on which our conclusions were formed, though we had forgotten whence they came.

“ The digest contains the substance of the answers given *by the officiating ministers* of all the parishes and chapelries in Great Britain. Sent out in May, 1818.

“The returns must generally be supposed to be most full and correct for the endowments, both because the state of these is less liable to fluctuation, and because the Committee did not direct its inquiries so minutely to unendowed schools, but rather required details respecting foundations, as a guide for the inquiries of the Commissioners into the abuses of charities.

“The omissions of unendowed schools in the returns are chiefly, *it is supposed*, in those from the larger towns, and particularly the metropolis; but whatever error there may be in the totals, it is likely to be by defect, and not by excess, &c.”

We really are astonished that, if Lord Brougham was pleased to rest his calculation of the increase upon a comparison of the Abstract and the Digest, he did not remember that he was proceeding on very doubtful grounds. These circumstances (*if* he had thought) he must have known: he must also have been aware, that the questions circulated on the two inquiries were widely different, as well as the persons through whom the inquiries were made (though an opportunity was not given to the public of examining how far they differed, by printing those of 1818 in the Digest); and he must have known that representations of the extreme imperfection of the returns in 1818 had been made indirectly by churchmen through the National Society's Reports, and more directly by dissenters, through the Sunday-School Union Reports. Yet, notwithstanding this kind of contradiction and hostility, his Lordship, as he intimates that he has been accustomed throughout his public life, proceeds forward;—opposition affects him not;—and he arrives at the conclusion which he expected and desired!—He may arrive at such a conclusion in a published speech; but we have no idea that, when the matter is deliberately weighed, such a process of unsound calculation will at all tend to effect the change in educational affairs which it is his object to bring about.

But, it may be asked, what has this error as to *the increase* of schools to do with the matter?—Do we believe or not that schools exist to *the extent* which is stated!—For that after all is the point.—Undoubtedly it is so. But it is something to know what the opinion of the legislator is worth, before we deliberate on the conclusion to which he comes. We differ from him as to *the extent* of schools as much as we do in regard to *the increase*; but the difference here is of another kind. Whatever surprise it may create among persons not conversant with these affairs to hear of the prodigious number of schools now existing, and comprising, as the speech informs us, one-eleventh of the population in daily schools; those who are connected with the societies for education know that there is a much *larger* proportion under instruction such

as it is. They know, what we undertake presently to prove, that the Sunday scholars and daily scholars are not mixed up in the manner that is supposed, so that "at least three-fourths, if not four-fifths of the one class belong also to the other;"—they know that the chairman of the Committee, in 1818, thought that "one half, more or less, of the Sunday-scholars might attend the daily schools," and they consider that even this statement is extreme.—Let it only be remembered that schools *of every kind* are comprised in the late inquiry, and who will imagine that the proportion of *one-eleventh is not far below the truth*. We have already alluded to the returns of Liverpool, we desire that the passage in the abstract itself should be read.

"The overseers of this important place appear to have bestowed much labour in endeavouring to obtain correct information respecting all schools in the parish;—but they observe that 'the returns from private schools are not satisfactory, many having refused to make returns, particularly the most expensive *daily schools*, together with *boarding schools*, many probably not liking to expose their numbers;—the inferior schools are suspected of being exaggerated;—wherefore the returns of private schools must be considered as defective, and in some instances delusive.'"
—Liverpool, vol. i. p. 445.

And then observe,—

"Liverpool, (population 165,175,) returns no more than 1601 children in private schools; while
Manchester, (population 142,026,) returns no less than 6,724."

And we have grounds for stating that these defects in the returns prevail to an extensive degree. For instance they are especially observable in Lancaster and in Middlesex;—in the former of these, Ashton, population 33,597, Lancaster, population 12,613, and Everton, population 4518, total, (with Liverpool,) population 245,903;—in the latter, Chelsea, population 32,371, Hillingdon, population 3842, St. Pancras, population 103,548, St. Mary le Strand, population 2462, Shadwell, population 9544, Shore-ditch, population 68,564, and Tottenham, population 6937, total, population 227,268, the deficiencies in the private daily schools are stated to be very great; so that here, in two remarkable counties (and they are pointed out as such by Lord Brougham), are defects in the returns of daily scholars amidst a population of 445,171 specifically reported. If Lord Kerry's inquiry were carried out to its full extent, i. e. if private schools for the middle and lower classes were to be entirely (as they are now partially) comprised in the returns, the proportion of the population under daily education would be vastly increased. And yet, forsooth, his Lordship's speech intimates that the returns are complete, and that one-eleventh is all that we must suppose to be under daily instruction, while he would have us make no account of Sunday-

scholars (often receiving instruction on certain evenings of the week), as if they were altogether neglected; as if they did not receive the only kind of instruction of which they can avail themselves at all after the age of nine years, under the powerless and inefficient factory bill.*

However, this extraordinary demand upon our credulity leads us on to the next point we undertook to notice, viz. *the unequal distribution of schools*. Lancashire and Middlesex are the counties his Lordship selects to illustrate "the melancholy conclusion" to which he arrives in this branch of the inquiry. He states that while the general average for the country is one-eleventh in schools,—

"Of Middlesex and Lancaster, I can speak with certainty, that the proportion is little more than one-fifteenth, being in each a deficiency of near 60,000 children, and these are the two counties in all England in which the importance of Education is the greatest; so that the provision for instruction is scanty, exactly in proportion as the circumstances of the people require that it should be abundant. For I ask whether the metropolitan and the great manufacturing counties are not those which every consideration of public policy and of public morals (if things which are one and the same must be spoken of as distinct) prompts us to instruct most liberally—to fill with the means of education—to stud over with schools?"—p. 10.

Now, let it be observed that Lancaster and Middlesex are two counties in which we have just shown that the returns of daily scholars, on which all is made to rest, are incomplete to a considerable extent, possibly on the whole to the extent of one-fourth, comprising places of smaller population than those specified. And after examining the two first volumes we confidently affirm that the defects in other less populous counties are not at all in the same proportion with these two. Here, therefore, is a *primâ facie* objection to the selection of counties which has been made.

This matter, however, as to the unequal distribution of schools, cannot be disposed of without explaining one great fallacy in Lord Brougham's speech. His Lordship lays aside the consideration of Sunday-schools,—

"Not from undervaluing those excellent institutions, or because the details relating to them are unimportant, but because of the limited nature of that kind of education, and the necessarily inferior advantages which alone it can bestow; for while one day in the week is very little towards the purposes of instruction, it is still less towards the benefits—the far more important benefits of moral discipline. It is evidently not merely the teaching of reading, writing, and ciphering, that profits the child: the regular school attendance is far more material for its improvement.

* See Mr. Braidley's (of Manchester) Evidence before Committee, 1834, Question 2310.

“ It is not because I value them less,—but because I prize the others more,—those schools in which the whole time of the children is spent under the master’s eye,—that I have said nothing of the numbers taught on Sundays. There is, indeed, another reason for keeping those numbers out of our calculation ; we have no means of knowing what proportion of the children attend the Sunday-schools alone, and how many attend both the Sunday and the day-schools.

But why could not the proportion of Sunday-scholars be just as easily taken as of those who attend during the week. They were both given in the Abstract. The children who attend either or both kinds of school were not distinguished ; no !—but this did not prevent a judicious calculator, who wished to ascertain the real state of things, from taking the average of both returns. For instance, it might have been said, the proportion of children in Sunday-schools, out of the whole population of England, is one-ninth, the proportion in Lancashire is above one-seventh ;—but the proportion of daily scholars in Lancashire is only one-fifteenth. At any rate here is some kind of compensation for the defect in daily education ; and there may be circumstances peculiar to that county or to Middlesex, which explain this variety of complexion that their moral and educational characters assume in the abstract. This was the manner in which we reasoned, and we have subsequently taken out of the population abstract the following statement ; viz. four agricultural counties, the first as they stand in alphabetical order, and which the speech implies are among the number that are best provided with daily schools, and then the two districts in which the state of education is said to be so grievously defective :—

	Number of Families.	Number of Families employed in Agriculture, Trade, &c.		Agricultural Labourers.	*Manufacturers and Handicraftsmen.
Bedford	20,016	11,364	5,137	11,588	5,540
Berks	31,081	14,047	9,884	14,802	11,279
Bucks	31,349	16,893	8,395	16,743	8,973
Cambridge	30,210	16,093	8,213	15,698	8,831
Four Agricultural Counties, }	113,156	58,397	31,629	58,831	34,623
Double the last line gives }	226,312	116,794	63,258	117,662	69,246
Lancashire	260,025	24,696	173,693	20,949	183,596
Metropolis	347,356	2,977	196,620	3,232	192,589

* Two divisions or classes are comprised in this column, viz. (1) Persons employed in manufacture, or in making manufacturing machinery, and (2) Persons employed in retail trade, or in handicraft, as masters or workmen ;—it appears necessary to combine these two classes in order to institute the comparison which was desired.

When we considered and compared the totals in the three lower lines under the several heads or columns, (the double of the agri-

cultural counties being taken in order to bring the districts which are compared to something like the same amount of families) and reflected on the general statement in the population abstract (preface, p. xii.), that of 2,745,336 families in England, there are employed in agriculture 764,348, and, in manufactures 1,182,912, we imagined we saw very obvious reasons why Lancashire and Middlesex should be defective in the proportion of daily schools, and also why any calculation made upon the state of education without reference to Sunday schools must be erroneous, not to say worthless. One grand charge, therefore, which we bring against the calculations of Lord Brongham is, (not merely that they are got up in haste) but that they are formed upon insufficient data. His lordship has drawn general conclusions from particular facts; he has surveyed less than half the evidence, and given his judgment in respect of the whole case. He has been led away by the error of the political economists of the day. For it appears to be admitted now, that the grand error in this department of study is that of drawing hasty conclusions from incomplete and ill digested evidence, from making the conclusion before *all* the different bearings of the subject have been surveyed.

That there are such things in the country as *Sunday school districts*, and *daily school districts*, that is tracts of land where these two kinds of school naturally and necessarily will predominate, we consider to be as clear as that there are districts suited respectively for pasture or for grain. But, for proof of this we will refer to the Abstract. Liverpool, Plymouth, and Portsmouth with Portsea, as commercial sea-ports are clearly different in their character from Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds, whence cottons, hardware, and woollens are respectively supplied. We should call the former *daily school districts*, and the latter *Sunday school districts*. What say the returns to such a distinction as this:—

	Daily Scholars not Infants.*	Sunday Scholars.
Liverpool	9,278	2,727
Plymouth	7,744	4,094
Portsmouth and Portsea, &c.	6,574	4,834
	<hr/> 23,693 <hr/>	<hr/> 11,655 <hr/>
Manchester	17,261	44,457
Birmingham	6,554	12,879
Leeds	5,624	14,098
	<hr/> 29,439 <hr/>	<hr/> 68,434 <hr/>

* Infant schools are omitted, because the instruction of children below seven years of age is very little affected by the ordinary pursuits of the place.

In the former kind of districts the daily are to the Sunday scholars as *two to one*; in the latter, the daily are to the Sunday as *one to two*. It will be found that in the sea-ports of Newcastle and Hull, as compared with Norwich and Nottingham, (of which we have also made trial) the same proportions will not hold good; that is, not to the same extent, but there are, we think, obvious causes to explain the variation, and to convert such exceptions into a proof of the general rule.—Or, else, our proposition may be proved by circumstances and by evidence of a very different kind. For instance, Mr. Robert Owen of Lanark—who (we should say) was born in a great Sunday school country, WALES, and had lived long in a Sunday-school district, *Manchester*, and was sixteen years in a daily school country, *Scotland* said—that he found,

“That at Newcastle-upon-Tyne where there are no manufactories in the neighbourhood to withhold the children from attending the school, they remained in it on an average about four years; while in the manufacturing districts, at Manchester and Leeds, the children do not remain on an average longer than three or four months.” See First Report of Committee on Education, 1816, p. 238.

When he said this, to our apprehension, he merely proved that Leeds and Manchester are *Sunday* school districts, and Newcastle is not. And every practical person we think must perceive that the distinction which we draw is too clear to need much proof.

The evidence submitted to the Education Committee last year, shewed that the educational clauses in the late factory bill were a dead letter,—that they took no effect; and consequently that the nature of the manufacturing countries in the point to which we allude remains the same as before.*

But Lord Brougham's whole argument proceeds without reference to this; and Lord Kerry's questions are drawn up with the same disregard to the important fact; (there is nothing in the questions which tends to give Sunday schools their proper honour and due rank, and no attempt is made to shew how far the duplicate entry of children under the two classes extends. It is not, therefore, from a spirit of opposition, or a wish to cry down those whose political sentiments are at variance with our own, that we express our opinion of the incompetence of these noblemen for the work which they have chosen for themselves. Our unprejudiced and deliberate opinion is, that the friends of education in the country have just reason to complain when such noble members *volunteer* their services in the cause which others might manage with more success;—and that the houses of parliament may

* See among other evidence that of Mr. Braidley; questions, 25, 34—7.

well feel dissatisfied when they perceive into what errors of opinion they have been drawn by the *political* vices of incompetence and haste.

We have spoken of the very limited view which Lord Brougham has taken of the subject on which he has pronounced judgment; and think that we have stated enough to substantiate the charge in respect of the *unequal distribution of schools*. But such accusations should never be made upon slight premises, and therefore before leaving this branch of the subject, we request our readers to observe that we have wholly omitted two important considerations, viz. (1) the *comparative wealth* of the working classes in the different counties, a cause of great influence among the people of the metropolis, as distinguished from all others; and (2) the *movement of population*, a singular fact which, we believe, was first brought to any accurate test by Mr. Richman in the population abstract; (see preface, vol. i. xlv. and p. xlviii.)

We have only space to say briefly on this matter, that the movement of population is proved by the increase or decrease of population in a given county beyond what can be explained from the difference between the number of births and the number of deaths; that the document we refer to shews upon this principle what the movement has been in the three decennial periods 1801—11; 1811—21, and 1821—31; that during these periods the influx into Lancashire has been respectively 45,284, 88,167, and 169,169, and into Middlesex 155,640, 132,717, and 182,561.* that these are not the numbers of people who merely come in, but the difference between those who come in and go out of the counties; and that where such vast changes are constantly taking place, there must be a great tendency to the unsettling of schools, or in other words, it cannot reasonably be expected that the same proportion of children shall be found in the schools.†

Before passing to another subject, on which his lordship touches with as much infelicity, as he has shewn inaccuracy in the comparative view of the counties, let us once for all notice that it is not to undervalue the effects of private benevolence that our re-

* The number of persons (single, and without families) who come to London annually to seek situations in the families of the rich, and to get work with the best tradesmen, may give some clue to this *movement of population*. Mr. W. F. Lloyd said 10,000 new servants annually arrive in the metropolis from country places. Education Committee, 1816, pp. 76 & 79.

† A considerable and regular increase appears to have taken place, from the movement of population, in (what are mostly Sunday-school districts, Chester, Durham, Northumberland, Stafford, the West Riding of York, &c.; - a decrease regularly in (what are generally daily school districts) Berks, Hereford, Rutland, Southampton, and North Riding of York, &c.; and a variation either way in the successive decennial periods in Beds, Bucks, Cornwall, Cumberland, Derby, Devon, Dorset, Essex, Herts, Hants, &c. and East Riding of York, &c.

marks have been made upon *the increase* of schools, nor is it to disprove the want of further means of education that we have declared our opinion as to *the extent* to which they exist at the present time. We have a public duty to discharge; and our object is to state the truth without reference to the conclusions which we or others may think will be drawn from our words. At the same time we do not hesitate to declare the inferences which we have drawn ourselves. 1. We think that the daily schools for the higher classes comprised in the returns, remain in point of number very nearly what they were in 1818; that is, that all who can pay for the education of their children in boarding-schools, &c. did so then, and do so now; but that the kind of education which their children receive from various causes is improved. 2. In regard to the infant schools we think that their number is more increased, and their character and efficiency is greatly improving, but not yet, *generally speaking*, much improved; where infant schools (properly so called) are established) half the dames' schools are given up, and the other half are improved from the effect of competition; but these institutions are as yet in *their infancy*, and we heartily desire with Lord Brougham to see them spread. 3. The chief increase no doubt has been in daily schools and Sunday schools for the poor,—a better kind of instruction is given in these schools than formerly was given; but wherever the former of these are established some allowance and deduction must be made for the petty and inferior schools which fall to the ground. All, as to numbers is not gain; but on the whole, both as to numbers and the character of education a vast improvement is everywhere effected. 4. With regard to the most populous parts of the country, to which the greatest attention is undoubtedly due, we submit that a much more correct account is given of them by the National Society in its twentieth report, 1831, than has lately been supplied, and a far more practical remedy is proposed for their remaining deficiencies than the noble mover of the resolutions has devised.

“In colliery, manufacturing and mining districts, large masses of population have often been rapidly collected without any of that mixture of rank, and intercourse between the rich and poor, which is so beneficially exercised in most parts of the kingdom. The inhabitants of the places alluded to consist, for the most part, of persons engaged in the various works carried on and little tradesmen who supply their wants, all residents possessed of property having usually moved away, deterred by the inconveniences attending the management of an extensive trade. In such places and under such circumstances the means of religious worship cannot be provided for adults, and the children consequently are suffered to grow up in utter ignorance of all their duties and privileges as Christians.

“Why, it will naturally be inquired, has this state of things been

permitted to exist? &c. . . . The Committee lament that so few persons have felt, and acted upon, the great duty of providing for the religious instruction of families collected together for their advantage and profit.

“ In such districts the clergyman is, in general, too much engaged with other duties to be able to attend effectually to the education of the young. The settlements alluded to are commonly made at a distance from his church. Perhaps the opening of a new mine, or manufactory, finds him occupied on the Sunday with churches very distantly situated amidst a scattered population, and the necessary occasional offices to be performed for his augmented charge consume whatever time he has to spare. Or perhaps he is led (where his bodily strength may suffice) to open his church for divine service a second or a third time in the day, and afford an opportunity of public worship to some among the thousands newly brought under his care. Little in aid of education can reasonably be expected from the most diligent clergyman thus circumstanced. At the same time, even amidst these obstacles, it is but justice to add, there are many whose exertions in establishing schools, or in the superintendence of them, have been productive of the greatest good. But it may be thought that the funds of the National Society might have been successfully brought to his aid. How those funds have been expended the Committee have made known from year to year. The National Society never undertook of itself to build rooms or support schools, but to aid and encourage local exertions for that purpose; and it has happened in consequence, that schools have in general been first established where funds for supporting them could be most readily secured. But unhappily no application could be made with success from many districts in which it was most desirable that schools should be established forthwith, from the want of resident gentry, and other opulent contributors. Hence, unfortunately, in many places of this description, containing thousands of families whose parents are members of the established church, no provision whatever exists for the education of children, according to the principles of that church.

But has no remedy been found for these cases? Is there not any quarter from whence help may be derived? To this it is replied, that the erection of new churches has led very generally to the establishment of schools, and that most of the Committee's largest grants during the last few years have been appropriated in aid of such schools, which are now filled with children whose parents gratefully acknowledge the blessings in which their families partake. This kind of remedy is indeed very gradual in its operation, but wherever applied, we may trust its success will be complete.

“ It remains, however, that a much more general and energetic effort should be made to surmount the great and accumulated evils which it is unquestionable do exist. We may hope, that, as ordinary towns and villages are supplied with good school-rooms, the Committee will be able by extended grants and promises of larger assistance to stimulate and encourage individuals possessed of property and interest in such populous districts. Much also may be done, where the time and strength of

the clergy are insufficient for the work, by the concurrence and co-operation of the members of the congregations under his charge. An actual expenditure of money to a large amount is, however, required. Without this, little can be done; and the Committee must look to public liberality for the means of fulfilling the expectations they have ventured to encourage. On the exertions of local societies to facilitate and promote this good work, on the co-operation of the archdeacons and other authorities, on the sanction and support of the diocesans, the Committee can confidently rely. They entertain too a sanguine hope, that when such a combination of influence is engaged in the task, the great proprietors in manufacturing and mining districts, although non-resident, will cheerfully and liberally promote the undertaking; and that a valuable portion of that careful superintendence will be exercised over the rising generation in these districts, hitherto inaccessible to religious instruction, which we are wont to regard as the greatest blessing of our country parishes, where the rich and poor meet together, and are equally the subjects of the pastor's care.

We now come to the *increase of schools*, and their improvement, which is necessarily connected with the kind of increase to which we refer;—and here it is more safe to quote from a document of authority just published, than from any opinion of our own.

“A few years since the Committee had a fair opportunity of judging of the actual fruits which had been reaped from the funds they had collected and distributed themselves. It then appeared that they had been compelled to restrain their grants, on an average, within the limit of one-fourth of the outlay which was required to be made; and a subsequent examination into the amount of their grants has shown that they have been instrumental in distributing upon this plan (during the twenty-four years that the National Society has existed) a little more than £105,000; to which must be added above £20,000, voted by the several district societies throughout the country, in furtherance of the same work. An expenditure to this amount, upon the principle just mentioned, (aided during the two last years by the parliamentary fund,) has, no doubt, secured a total outlay in building considerably exceeding half a million of money. This is independent of the occasional assistance given to schools for the training of masters, and on other accounts, and also of a very large number of national schools, which have been established and provided with school-rooms by private persons, and of many endowed schools, which have been enlarged and thrown open to the public by the trustees, who, though they are acting generally upon the Society's principles and plans, have not hitherto entered formally into union.—Such is the result of the exertions made directly for the extending of schools by means of the National Society's grants.”—*Annual Report, 1835.*

And after an attempt to calculate the number of children under education throughout the country by average, according to the

information furnished in the *two first* volumes of the Abstract (then published), the statement proceeds—

“ The circumstance, however, which must be chiefly gratifying is this, viz. that whilst the Abstract shows the gross increase of schools between the years 1818 and 1835 to have been, in the thirty-three counties, 1, 276,706 out of 2,014,144, or somewhat above 100 per cent., an examination of the accounts of the Society, at the same interval, show that national schools have been advancing at the rate of above 300 per cent.; in fact, that *the work of education in the Society's hands has been carried forward with an acceleration three times greater than that which has been made by the exertions of the public at large.*

“ At the period of the Society's incorporation in 1817, the amount of children in national schools was 117,000; and allowing for the increase which was made in the subsequent year, and comparing this total with the amount to which the Society's scholars have now arrived, being above half a million at the present time, the Committee feel no difficulty in establishing this fact, so highly creditable to the district societies and the local superintendents of schools, and so truly a subject of thanksgiving to Almighty God.”

In our few remarks on the third and fifth resolutions respecting infant schools, though we are deeply impressed with the value of such institutions, we feel bound to express some dissent from the kind of advocacy which the subject receives. We have already observed that these institutions have partaken in the parliamentary grants, and we think it far from expedient that two separate funds should be created for the two sorts of schools; more especially since the natural state of things in Sunday school districts is to combine the infant and the Sunday school, and make one large room serve for both. We differ, moreover, as to the opinion that manufacturing districts are more adapted, or have a much stronger claim on public bounty in such a cause, than those of an agricultural character. Lord Brougham, in his Speech, p. 14, treats with respect the Rev. William Wilson's knowledge of the infant school system, and it is the opinion of that gentleman that agricultural neighbourhoods and villages are particularly suited to children in their tenderest years.* Infant schools, we have been assured, had their origin in the agricultural district committed to the care of Pastor Oberlin, and we are disposed to think that where the plant is indigenous, there it will flourish best with care. And it is obviously true that the dulness of labouring children, and the early age at which they are taken out to watch fields and pick stones, &c. should be met by such a kind of remedy, and that they should be made as intelligent and tractable as possible, so that they may be afterwards the

* See Education Committee, 1834, Rev. W. Wilson, question 2215.

more fit and more gratified with the pursuits of the Sunday school. We would also utter our humble protest against the egotistic declaration repeated in the Speech, that "I, with some others, about seventeen years since, began the first of these seminaries." Lord Brougham knows that the matter is at least in dispute. He told the Education Committee only last year,* that Mr. Wilson, who had the best infant school that was anywhere to be seen, said that "his brother previously established one in Spitalfields, (*i. e.* previously to the one in Brewer's Green,) and that he believed there had been another," which other Lord Brougham supposes to have been that in Brewer's Green; but this is to take for granted the thing which is denied. Our chief objection, however, lies against the bombastic praise which is bestowed on infant schools, and of which the following specimen must suffice:—

"During the period between the ages of eighteen months or two years, and six—I will even say and five, he learns much more of the material world—of his own powers—of the nature of other bodies—even of his mind, and of other minds—than he ever after acquires during all the years of boyhood, youth and manhood. Every child, even of the most ordinary capacity, learns more, acquires a greater mass of knowledge, and of a more useful kind, at this tender age, than the greatest philosopher is enabled to build upon it during the longest life of the most successful investigation—even were he to live to eighty years of age, and pursue the splendid career of a Newton or a La Place. The knowledge which the infant stores up—the ideas which are generated in his mind—are so important, that if we could suppose them to be afterwards obliterated, all the learning of a senior wrangler at Cambridge, or a first-class man at Oxford, would be as nothing to it, and would literally not enable its victim to prolong his existence for a week. All that he learns during those years he learns not only without pain, but with an intense delight—a relish keener than any appetite known at our jaded and listless age—and learns in one-tenth of the time which in after-life would be required for its acquisition. It is really wonderful how much a child knows, at the age of seven, that he ought not to know, unless great pains have been taken to teach him better; to exclude the worst species of knowledge from his mind, and prevent the most mischievous habits from becoming a second nature to him. Listless, indolent, inattentive habits are formed before the age of seven, and the victim of curiosity becomes an indocile being. Perverse and obstinate habits are formed before the age of seven, and the mind that might have been moulded like wet clay in a plastic hand, becomes sullen, intractable, obdurate, after that age. But the history of infant schools has been consolatory to the philanthropist; their manifest good effects have roused the attention of the community to the sacredness of the trust reposed in their hands—to the absolute necessity of effecting a total change in the system of education—to the incalculable benefits derived from the

* Education Committee, 1854, question 2829.

infusion of useful learning, upon sound principles, into the minds of children at the docile age, and of giving them innocent pursuits and wholesome habits, while these can yet be implanted in a virgin soil."

We appeal from such unseemly praise, and much of the kind with which the Speech abounds, to the wiser view of education taken by the Lord Chancellor in 1834.

"That the character and habits of men will be improved, and the amount of crimes greatly lessened (by education), I confidently expect; but it is a wild imagination to fancy that crime can ever be extirpated, and betokens an unwise enthusiasm on one subject, causing a species of blindness to other considerations."

How much in keeping with this second extract is the judicious view which was taken of the subject in the Bishop of London's Charge to the Clergy long before the Resolutions saw the light.

"I am a zealous friend, upon conviction, to infant schools for the children of the poor. No person, who has not himself watched them, can form an adequate notion of what these institutions, when judiciously conducted, may effect, in forming the tempers and habits of young children; in giving them, not so much actual knowledge, as that which at their age is more important—the habit and facility of acquiring it; and in correcting those moral defects which neglect, or injudicious treatment, would soon confirm and render incurable. The early age at which children are taken out of our national schools is an additional reason for commencing a regular and systematic discipline of their minds and wills, as soon as they are capable of profiting by it; and that is, at the very earliest opening of the understanding, and at the first manifestation of a corrupt nature, in the shape of childish petulance and waywardness."

We proceed reluctantly to other matter which Lord Brougham presses on our attention, viz. *the kind of instruction given in schools, and the means of improving it.*

After all the praise which has been bestowed on the promoters of education, and all the success which is acknowledged to have crowned their toil, we certainly were unprepared for so unkind a cut from such a hand. We did not expect "*charges*" and "*grounds of complaint*" against the schools established; we should rather have expected that his lordship would have reasoned thus:—"The instruction in the schools is not what I desire; it is being carried further in other countries, and it may be carried with advantage just as far here as it is abroad;—but, wait a few years; this consequence must necessarily follow in due course;—the effect of teaching every one to read, and write, and cipher, must infallibly be, that those who desire to excel will find the means of doing more; the spreading and rising of the leaven of knowledge must certainly force the public standard of attainment higher up;—only compare what the country now is with regard to schools with what it was some twenty years

"ago, and you must perceive that the change from a limited to
 "a more extended range of instruction is literally as nothing in
 "comparison with the work that has been done. The same spirit
 "and the same funds which have effected one object will accom-
 "plish the other too;—these beneficent persons have grappled
 "successfully with the first difficulty; why should their energies
 "fail with the next? School-rooms are built and building faster
 "than parliament will consent to give its aid;—the grant of
 "£20,000 last year has brought an excess of claims for above
 "£45,000 in aid of this work; the people are waiting impa-
 "tiently till another grant is made,—*do leave the machine, which*
 "*is in such steady, constant, rapid movement, alone.* And what
 "can you want that you interfere; see what *some* of the schools
 "already are, what a variety of subjects they teach; read what the
 "Bishop of London has written to the clergy,* and do wait for the
 "fruits of such advice. If it fails of its effect, we can move in the
 "matter at last, and in the meanwhile schools will be going at
 "their present extraordinary rate of increase."

This, we say, is the sort of reasoning which we should rather have expected to hear; and it really seems to us that a variety of other arguments might have come in aid of this. It might have been asked—"Are you sure that the state of the people on the
 "continent is much better than that of our own? It is admitted
 "that their compulsory system would not suit us; is it quite cer-
 "tain that the kind of instruction which they are said to receive
 "is what we want? And, if it is, is it certain that our people
 "generally have made that sort of progress which will dispose
 "them cheerfully to concur in the work? For if they call the in-

* "Religion ought to be made the ground-work of all education; its lessons should be interwoven with the whole tissue of instruction, and its principles should regulate the entire system of discipline in our national schools. But I believe that the lessons of religion will not be rendered less impressive or effectual by being interspersed with teaching of a different kind. The Bible will not be read with less interest, if history, for example, and geography, and the elements of useful practical science, be suffered to take their turn in the circle of daily instruction. On the contrary, I am persuaded, that the youthful mind will recur, with increased curiosity and intelligence, to the great facts, and truths, and precepts of Holy Writ, if it be enlarged and enlivened by an acquaintance with other branches of knowledge. I see no reason why the education given to the poor should differ from the education of their superiors, more widely than the different circumstances and duties of their respective conditions in life render absolutely necessary. One thing is certain, and it is a very important consideration, that if we teach them the methods of acquiring one kind of knowledge, they will apply them to the acquisition of other kinds; if we sharpen their faculties for one purpose, they will be sure to use them for others. Some information, on subjects of general interest, many of them will undoubtedly seek to obtain; and it is plainly desirable that they should receive it from our hands in a safe and unobjectionable form. It is desirable also, that they should not be accustomed to consider that there is anything like an opposition between the doctrines and precepts of our holy religion and other legitimate objects of intellectual inquiry; or that it is difficult to reconcile a due regard to the supreme importance of the one, with a certain degree of laudable curiosity about the other." *Bishop of London's Charge, 1834.*

“ introducing of a new set of subjects (which, it may be, in their
“ ignorance and prejudice they despise) an interfering with their
“ voluntary schools, the whole system may be affected thereby,
“ and a vast derangement take place.”

We are rather disposed to dwell upon this last point, because we can hardly conceive a more direct and disagreeable kind of interference than that which provides, that supporters of a school shall not take the teacher whom they prefer, but they shall take a man who has been educated in a particular place. If a nobleman supports a school for the people on his estate, we scarcely know any measure more likely to create disgust in his mind than the want of ability to appoint some respectable tenant's son, or daughter, who may have a turn for teaching, and a great degree of influence over the children and their parents, and who yet may have no taste for geometry, or decimals, or the pursuits of a normal school; or if, as is frequently the case, a school is supported upon religious grounds by the congregation of some church or chapel, and they are told, when a vacancy in the mastership occurs, either that they cannot appoint a person of their own sentiments whom they may prefer, or that, if they do appoint him, he must go for three years to be trained; really we should expect that they would give the school up. We know how very sensitive religious people are in this country on such matters, and though we are of opinion that there may be occasions in which the feeling is allowed to operate improperly, yet it is a feeling which certainly exists, and which will not brook the rough usage which is here proposed. “ Very well,—(we should expect for
“ answer, when the experiment was tried,) worldly knowledge
“ was not the object we had in view,—our subscriptions shall
“ henceforth go to a more strictly religious use, such as mis-
“ sionary, or book societies, &c. We will have our Sunday-school;
“ the children may meet in the church or chapel, if we are in-
“ duced to surrender or sell our school-room; we will teach them
“ to read, and lend them religious books for the week.” And, then, what will become of the teacher, trained with a view to such an appointment, at a considerable public expense for a number of years.

The funds for education are now drawn chiefly out of sources which religion supplies or opens, and it is an opinion that we have held since this subject of parliamentary normal schools was first mooted, that their effect will be to close the hand of piety towards the daily school, and open it principally, if not exclusively, in favour of the Sunday-school.

We may be right or wrong in this opinion,—but, at any rate, we are persuaded that the measure would be universally regarded

as one of direct interference;—and, in proof of this opinion, it is in our power to bring witnesses from strange quarters;—to summon men to speak on our behalf in this question, who never intended to utter a syllable that might be turned to this account. We refer to a class of persons, of some importance in these days, who declare that they will take no rest until the doors of the two Universities are thrown open to people of every religion in the land; and who press us to weariness with such arguments as these:—“Why not throw the Universities open to all?—Retain the tutors, professors, and lecturers, of your own religion, if you please;—but, what earthly objection can you have to let Jews or Turks come and hear what you have to teach and say in favour of Christianity?—or, Unitarians learn the elements and principles of moderate Calvinism?—or, Independents pick up knowledge from Episcopalians?—What effect can it have to make this concession, except just this, that they who now exist in the country and dislike you because you shut your doors in their face, will begin to respect you, first perhaps, on account of your learning, and then, on account of the charitable and liberal feeling which induces you to compassionate their wants. And this feeling they will ultimately impute to the religious principles which you profess.—Instead of keeping them together, marshalled in array against you, they will be gradually mixed up with your own forces and acquire your habits of thinking and acting, until half of them, at least, become part of yourselves;—all is safe so long as the tutors, and lecturers, and public officers, of the colleges are true and faithful men.” All this kind of wisdom and serpent-like dealing has so often met with an antagonist of equal and superior strength, that we have no fear of leaving the argument without a reply. But, how are we surprised to find that those who reason after this kind of fashion, when it suits their purpose, can suddenly turn round and argue the other way; that these astute pleaders are the very persons who advocate the normal schools. “We will not *interfere*, say they;—the system works a great deal too well to be touched; we praise your endeavours, and wish to give you the only thing you want;—the circle of instruction in your schools is far from complete, we will provide you with the only thing you require further, with masters who shall do all that is desired;—fear not, you shall have some men who can draw, teach music and geometry, and sciences of every kind;—just leave the controlling of your schools in our hands,—we wish to train the masters only, having publicly pledged ourselves not to interfere!!” And this they say to men who from religious motives are supporting schools; and they are astonished

at the coldness with which their proposals are received. And they say, that this is mere bigotry and fanaticism in the extreme; they do not believe, after all, that we seek the real improvement of the people, or else we should pursue a very different course, and cordially co-operate with them in this plan.

So much for the theory of non-interference, and the practical working, in this respect, of normal schools. Such consequences, and others like them, might easily have been overlooked. But, we are all amazement when we hear any individual who pretends to a competent knowledge of the subject of which he speaks, assure an intelligent body of men, that seminaries for the training of masters will prove an invaluable gift, *because*, forsooth, they will not clash or interfere with any existing system.

“It is this which, above every thing, we ought to labour to introduce into our system; for as there are *not more than two* now established by the exertions of individual benevolence, and as, from the nature of the institution, it is not adapted to be propagated by such efforts, no possible harm can result from the interposition of the legislature in this department.”—p. 23.

What!—a person professing to know the state of education, assert that there are not more than two training-schools!—we have before us the report of the principal education society which speaks of about forty such institutions, giving their names, the acting officers, and the number of children in them, and the number of persons, whom they have trained (above 2000), and the advantages which they afford to persons while in training,—intellectual, &c. through the medium of the visiting clergy, &c.—and pecuniary in the shape of allowances, often amounting to twelve shillings a week, so long as attendance is regularly given at the training-school. And yet Lord Brougham assures us that there are only two!—We really are at a loss how to proceed in controversy with a person who *argues* thus, i. e. by a flat denial of the truth! Is not, then, the Barrington institution at Bishop’s Auckland a training school?—or, is the endowment left for it by the bishop one of those important trusts which is so much abused?—or, is this the extent of the noble legislator’s knowledge of other charitable bequests connected with education, which, after twenty years inquiry by a parliamentary commission, he desires to have investigated again? Are the funds which the York, and the Durham, and the Winchester, and the Bath and Wells societies,—and the Chichester, and the Exeter, and the Lichfield, and the Norwich, and the Suffolk, and the Northampton, societies, &c. &c. to be utterly despised and made of no account?—or, are not

* See Report of National Society for 1855, p. 9; and Appendix, p. 49, &c.

their central schools as capable of improvement by parliamentary aid, as ordinary village schools are capable of amelioration by appointing proper national school-masters, and building proper rooms?—And is it not as direct an interference with such institutions to establish rival training-schools, as it would be to set up a government-school for any parish where a private institution of the kind was already formed?

London, York, Liverpool, Durham, and Exeter, are selected by his lordship as the fittest spots in which the experiment may be tried, and in each of these towns we perceive that the National Society has a central school which would sink, no doubt, before a parliamentary rival, as certainly as it would rise and flourish by the aid of the public funds.

What!—is the system of training so fully described to the Committee of the House of Commons* last year, and so largely set forth in the evidence, collected and printed, in vain? and this by a witness whom the committee called the last, who might have known what had been said?—And the advantages† and encouragements provided by public beneficence, are they to be disturbed and set aside in order that a foreign system of training may be tried on the suggestion of a person who declares, that “*the foreign system is wholly inapplicable to this country.*‡ And the system of inspection, and visiting and examining, and awarding prizes,§ which is operating so beneficially, is this too to be all swept away! and that upon an “*ipse dixit*,” that there are but two training-schools?

We are not quite sure whether the noble mover allows the National Society to have any training school at all. We never heard of a second Lancasterian school of the kind, but from what was said in the evidence last year (*qu.* 2831.) the Sessional school at Edinburgh may possibly be meant by this second school. Perhaps it were due and fair towards his Lordship to suppose that this is the case. For, certain it is, that with a profession of neutrality, he expresses a decided predilection on both occasions (in 1834 and now) for the British Schools, and speaks only of them, or intimates a very low opinion of national schools. And yet, when he sat as chairman of the Committee on Education in 1816, he may remember that he heard evidence from witnesses of a different opinion. He admired Mr. Robert Owen's zeal and intelligence (we merely select a witness who cannot be suspected

* Education Committee, 1834, questions 741, &c., 741, &c.

† Education Committee, 1834, question 800; National Society's Report, 1835, p. 59, &c.

‡ Education Committee, 1834, question 2321 to Lord Brougham.

§ Evidence before Education Committee, 1834, question 1885-6-7; and National Society's Report, 1835, p. 70, &c.

of favouring church affairs,) and he borrowed the Infant school system, and Buchanan the school master from the Lanark mills; and yet Mr. R. Owen told the Committee

“That, as the result of his experience he thought—that the Madras system possessed an advantage over the British and Foreign,—by the former, the children learn to read in a shorter time and a more accurate manner; in other respects he could not think there was much difference;—and then Mr. Owen explained—what was hard to understand no doubt,—that he meant ‘the distinct manner in which the children pronounce the words, and the manner also, in which their attention is directed to the whole subject.’”*

But, however this may be, as to the kind of training school which would be most highly valued according to the sentiments which different persons hold, we have yet to be satisfied, and the country requires proof that normal schools for furnishing a set of more accomplished school masters would answer their design.

We have in former articles declared our decided opinion in favour of gradually introducing a variety of subjects of instruction into schools, (after the manner proposed in the Bishop of London’s charge,) as having a tendency to the increase of religion as well as intelligence, and as beneficial to the people and the community in every respect. But, we have always felt a difficulty which has obviously escaped Lord Brougham in his rapid steps;—the question has always been on our lips,—“How are these better educated men to be paid?—If you raise the standard of education *throughout the country* there will be no ground (from the distinctions of scholarship) for raising wages at all. But if you give a better education to schoolmasters, while clerks, warehousemen, &c. remain as they now are, the salaries of the former class must be increased, or else the men whom you have trained will become clerks, &c., and the outcasts from that grade or profession of persons, will take refuge in the schools.”

We were happy to find that this practical view of the subject was taken in the Report of the National Society, as it certainly was established by the evidence collected last year from witnesses of every religious party. The report says,

“It is plainly unreasonable to expect that a class of persons of superior abilities, and capable of filling situations which are remunerated with better salaries, should renounce such opportunities of temporal advantage, and devote themselves to the arduous duties of a Parochial School. The difficulty always experienced by the Society has been that of providing salaries for teachers, not that of finding well-educated persons who were willing to enter into training, and devote their time to the education of the young. Such persons are never wanting where

* First Report of Education Committee, 1816.—p. 233.

adequate salaries are provided. But, if the qualifications and abilities of teachers were to be raised by means of any system of training, without, at the same time, raising the remuneration which they receive, it is not probable that the experiment would proportionably benefit the schools. The temptation to accept the same as a better reward for some other employment, at a more easy rate of exertion, would be constantly diminishing the numbers of those who had been prepared, with the greatest expense and care, for the business of conducting schools. The Committee can assert that this view of the subject is not merely theoretical, but that it has been founded in practice; and within the last few years that persons who have been sent to London, at the expense of the managers of country schools, and who have made considerable progress in the central school, have, after a time, relinquished their situations for others of higher value, and which they had become competent to hold by the training and instruction which they had there received. Reference may also be made to other evidence calculated to establish the same conclusion.*

And this passage is followed by several useful suggestions respecting limited payments from scholars towards making up salaries, the applying of small charitable endowments in aid of the same object, and the building of dwelling houses, and providing gardens, both as a pecuniary assistance to the teachers and an appropriate recreation for their leisure hours. This scheme for the improvement of schoolmasters, and how it will work, we can clearly understand, but how a higher kind of training and accomplishment will tend for the good of the poor, is quite unintelligible. In fact, one of the most practical witnesses whom the Committee summoned and questioned much on this very point, (Mr. Crossly, the master of the Borough Road training school,) gave his opinion.

(Qu. 1072) "That if the salaries of school-masters remained at 70*l.* or 80*l.* a year, and the abilities of those persons were raised as much as all must desire, you could hardly expect to retain their services, for they would get 150*l.* a year of a tradesman in the next street; and, (Qu. 1073.) that the effect of a system of high training would be to increase the amount of education among the middle classes in the country, although it would not do much to favor the education of the poor."

What is the worth of parliamentary evidence, if testimony such as this to a plain matter of fact, is to be recorded for the information of the country, and a law made next year directly in violation of what it substantiates? We regard it as a singular coincidence that while we were thinking upon these affairs, a letter reached us from an old correspondent near Leeds, in which he wrote in the following words—

* See *Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1834, from various witnesses*, 99*o.*, &c.; 1057, &c.; 1067, &c.; 1073, &c.; 1317, &c.; 1596, &c.; 1698, &c.; 1901, &c.; 1903, &c.

"I have devoted the last six years to the endeavour to form a master for my school, and through him, to initiate others, and to a certain degree have succeeded; but am quite convinced that any man that I could recommend as a schoolmaster to a situation worth 60*l.* a year, could have *more than 100*l.* a year*, in a common tradesman's employment."

And yet, on turning back to the third report of the Committee on Education, which was made in June 1818, (and to a certain bill prepared for parliament in 1821,) when the public system of education by a parish rate was advocated, which Lord Brougham now so strenuously condemns, we read the following words:

"The inhabitants must have the burden of paying the school-master's salary, *which ought certainly not to exceed twenty-four pounds a year*. It appears to your Committee that a sufficient supply of school-masters may be procured for this sum, allowing them the benefit of taking scholars who can afford to pay, and permitting them of course to occupy their leisure hours in other pursuits."—p. 57.

Really, this sort of blowing hot and cold with the same mouth, (this securing well-educated persons at the ordinary wages of labouring men) appears so like necromancy, that we had rather not act in conjunction with those who profess such an art. Ours is a simple course. We want to educate children in the principles of the Church, and consistently with this, to do them all the good we can both as to their intellectual and their social condition. But, in this commercial country, money will have its weight, and knowledge will act as power, and we despair of obtaining competent schoolmasters, or any other class of official persons to persevere in the duties of their vocation, unless they are in some measure adequately paid. Lord Brougham has renounced the principles of the bill which he brought into parliament in 1821, and we do not despair of hearing that his lordship has renounced or modified his present opinions as to training schools.

That his lordship is capable of altering his plan of acting, no one can dispute who reads the speech on education, at the head of this article. We do not merely refer to general schemes for legislation, but to the particular system and principles on which such schemes are advocated. The train of argument in the middle of this (now) public document, undergoes the most extraordinary change we remember to have observed in any address of the kind. The first portion of the address is founded upon (so called) facts,—upon dry returns obtained from all parts of the country, and digested into regular order. And his lordship boasts that this is the kind of foundation on which he delights to build. Why then, when the matter of charitable endowments is introduced, is an edifice raised up, by the side of the first building, which is constructed upon such a different plan? We certainly expected, when we came to this part of the speech, that now, at

last, the cry against abused endowments would assume a tangible shape, and that we should know exactly what it was which excited so strong a feeling in the minds of certain rather vociferous persons. But we lamented to find that, as usual on these occasions, *the feelings* of the auditors were addressed! General complaints of the hardships of poor and industrious people (the working classes) were made! No names of men or places where the abuse existed were pointed out; no testimony brought forward to prove what the feeling of the country might be on the subject then submitted to the house!—Were there, then, no public documents to which his lordship could have recourse? Were there no inquiries of this nature in which his lordship had been engaged? Had not the sense of the country been taken, or at least the opinions of those persons been collected who lived on the spot, and were most competent to judge of the practical working of the several bequests, for the management of which a new board of Commissioners was to be formed? The natural inference would be, that this was not the case. And yet, in 1833, when his lordship was in office, and Lord Kerry's inquiry was begun, it is an undoubted fact, that questions* were addressed to the officiating ministers of parishes, to be communicated by them to the trustees of charities, and answers required, to ascertain how far it might be possible or desirable to interfere in regard to these bequests. But, nothing is said of the result of this inquiry:—though it is generally supposed that it was by no means such as would have promoted his lordship's views. The object now is, to get a new commission appointed to accomplish the design first undertaken some twenty years ago, by the mover of the resolutions, of procuring the funds of endowed and grammar, and other schools, to be applied to the benefit of the working classes at large.

Now we have no disposition to fight the battles of Reading, and St. Bees, and Pocklington, with Mere, Spital, Yeovil, Croydon, Wellingborough, Huntingdon, and other charities, over again! We have no heart to renew the controversy about "*pauperes et indigentes scholares*!"—what the words mean, or where

* Copy of questions circulated in 1833:

1. If there is any Charity in the _____ of _____, with respect to which there are no specific Directions from the Donors as to any particular Mode of distributing or employing the same for the use or benefit of the poor;—Are you of opinion, that the present Mode of disposing of or of employing the same is the most beneficial to the Poor?

2. Are you of opinion, that the proceeds or profits arising from any Charity of the above description may be employed more beneficially for the Poor in the Education of their Children?

3. If in the _____ of _____, there is any Charity for the Education or Benefit of the Poor, part of the Income of which has been employed in Clothing or Maintenance; Are you of opinion, that it would be more beneficial to the Poor to extend Education to a greater number of Children, instead of giving Clothing or Maintenance?

they are to be found?*

We had hoped that the ineffectual efforts made so long ago, to convince the public of any monstrous misapplication of the great funds alluded to, must have put an end to such language and insinuations as we regret to see repeated in his lordship's speech. Far less do we desire to screen any abuse, or afford any shelter for those who are capable of misapplying benevolent endowments. We desire, by all means, that they should be brought to the light; and if an act of parliament be necessary, as we think it is, to facilitate the renewal of trusts, and the improved application of trust funds, and for various other beneficial purposes in connexion with charities, certainly let it be prepared and passed; but we have distinct and strong objections to the measures on the subject which are comprised in the resolutions, and we shall state them in conclusion, under specific heads.—

1. It is unreasonable to institute a new commission, when a set of commissioners who have long had experience in this very business are at their posts and ready to proceed.† Their authority, we presume, expires with the session; why should it not be renewed? If the individuals are incompetent, by all means let *them* be changed, not the commission; if they are not incompetent, why bring in new men, unacquainted with the business, to explore, for the second time, a country which they already know? If new powers are desirable, let them be supplied. Surely there is no body of men so competent as this very commission to state where the difficulties lie which it requires the help of the legislature to overcome. The greater part of the country has been investigated by their assistance;—is it fair on the counties which have not partaken of the benefits which have resulted from their inquiries, that they only should be overlooked?

We are sure that what was said of another committee, in June, 1818, is equally true of these men;—why should they not proceed upon a plan which has worked so well?

“They are happy in being able to add, that the discussion excited by the first Report, and the arguments urged in the committee to various patrons of charities, have had the salutary effect of improving the administration of those institutions, and inculcating the importance of rather bestowing their funds in merely educating a larger number than in giving both instruction and assistance to a more confined number of children.”—*Third Report from Select Committee, June, 1818* (426), p. 55.

* See Quarterly Review, 1818.—Review of a letter to Sir S. Romilly, by H. Brougham, Esq., and other documents.

† The Commission appointed, 58 Geo. 3, c. 91, to inquire concerning charities in England for the education of the poor; the act being subsequently amended, and their powers enlarged, though not perhaps to the requisite extent.

2. Then, as to the work which the new commission is to perform—to *superintend the grants voted by Parliament for promoting education, &c.* This employment is in direct opposition to the plan which has been found so excellent, according even to the testimony of Lord Brougham. The Lords of the Treasury, *for the sake of avoiding all interference with schools*, determined that no money should be granted except upon reports from one of the two societies which were allowed to represent or to embrace the opinions of those who promoted schools of every kind. The business, upon this plan, has been transacted at the Treasury *without any expense* to the country beyond the mere printing of a few sheets for the information of parliament as to what had been done each year. All parties appear satisfied—all say the plan succeeds, and that the difficulties arising out of a diversity of religious sentiments are admirably escaped; yet the resolution says, in effect, “Let a change be made, and a commission appointed, at a vast expense, and at the hazard of breaking up the unanimity and good feeling which prevail.”

3. Next, the power of watching over “the abuses of trust committed by the trustees, &c.,” however well it may sound as an abstract principle, as explained in the speech, appears to us to be objectionable and hazardous in the extreme.

“Whether any thing further may be done for improvement in this matter, I will not at present say. In the first instance, this may be sufficient; but, at all events, endowments of every kind ought to be jealously watched. Trustees should be repeatedly called to account; they should be aware that there are still some persons in authority who have a control over them, although the Commissioners are no more.”—p. 28.

Is it possible to suppose that the interests of charities would be promoted if this system of *jealously watching* and *repeatedly calling to account* is put in force? At present the most respectable gentlemen in the country form the principal body of trustees. Is it probable that the character of these agents will be raised or deteriorated if they are subject to these inquisitorial powers? Some of the trustees are careless, no doubt, and indolent; perhaps they neglect the school, as they do their own affairs; they put up with some abuse, rather than bestir themselves to correct it, as they ought. But we rarely hear, if ever, of any thing sounding like intentional misconduct or fraud; and from time to time, as opportunity arises, some beneficial change takes place; the funds are applied in a more advantageous manner, and very frequently of late they have been merged in the salaries of national school teachers, so as to supply a kind of guarantee for

the permanence of the institutions formed by aid of the parliamentary grants. In the Report of the National Society for this year to which we have already referred, it is observed :—

“ How much may be done this way by friendly representations (viz., in applying for the support of schools small bequests and charitable endowments) will be best conceived when it is known, that out of the 300 applications for aid in building schools, which have been last received by the Committee, there are 58 cases in which an arrangement, such as is contemplated, has been brought about, and endowments, though generally of a small amount, secured in aid of schools.”

But what if the gentry are disgusted at the continual interference of the contemplated commission, and give up the concern into the hands of those who, the chairman in 1816 said, could “ *thwart the Education Committee at every turn*”—

“ those same tradesmen who rejected, at one institution, the proposition of Mr. Justice Bayley, to prevent the house being furnished by articles from the shops of the committee of management, and thus made that most learned, most honest, and most humane judge withdraw in disgust from a charity which he found systematically perverted to purposes of the most sordid avarice.”—*Speech*, 1835, p. 27.

Will his lordship only call to mind a discussion which took place respecting a savings bank in Hertfordshire, not very long since, in which some learned member said, in the upper house, that “ nothing ought to be done to scare *noble persons* from undertaking trusts of this nature : such a course would be exceedingly prejudicial to these useful establishments”?*—viz., a course which would expose persons of property and respectability to those inconveniences which would make them decline undertaking the office of trustees ; and will he be pleased to apply the argument to the case which was submitted to consideration in the same place on the 21st of May ?

4. In addition, however, to these circumstances, we think it still very doubtful whether we are authorized to sweep away all the charity schools, which is the ultimate design of the Commission, and establish in the place of them a number of large schools, on the system of mutual instruction, open to all. We have watched the operations of the two kinds of institution—the Charity, and the National or Lancastrian, School—and we are by no means certain that the superiority of the latter (setting apart other considerations) is such as to justify the change.

No doubt it is out of the question to think of forming charity schools for all ; but this is quite a different proposition from the altering the condition of those which at present subsist. Few people

* Lord Brougham's speech, 11th June, 1835.

are aware that although the large open schools present so imposing an appearance, and are so grateful to the eye when viewed *en masse*, they assume a heart-breaking appearance in some of their details. To pass over the collecting together of such immense multitudes of children, where good and bad are indiscriminately mixed up, and the inferior degree of moral and individual influence which a teacher must exercise in a very large school, we may bring the question to a direct issue another way,—what is the period which children spend in the endowed or charity schools, and in the national or Lancastrian schools? We can refer to the National Society's Reports for 1830, p. 86, and 1832, p. 96, and 1834, p. 60, for proofs of what we mean—proofs which have been honestly put forth by the Society with the desire, not of exposing defects, but of calling attention to the fluctuation of scholars in large schools, and accomplishing a cure if possible.

We have it also in our power to bring the question to a clearer test. We have been permitted to try the experiment in four schools, situated in the same parish of St. James, Westminster, and under circumstances calculated on every account to make the trial a fair one. The schools are all superintended and examined constantly, and the national schools have the advantage (which the other schools have not, of learning geography, and history, and other popular subjects. Their continued increase of numbers is a proof, also, that they are held in esteem by the people. The following table shows the result:—

	Burlington School.		Offertory School.		National Schools. No Clothes, &c. Children pay One Penny weekly.			
	Girls Boarded, Clothed, &c.		Boys Clothed, &c.		Boys.		Girls.	
	Admit- ted.	On the Books.	Admit- ted.	On the Books.	Admit- ted.	On the Books.	Admit- ted.	On the Books.
1829 ..	18	100	19	30	102	115	94	103
1830 ..	17	100	22	30	172	191	96	120
1831 ..	25	110	19	30	192	191	127	113
1832 ..	20	110	21	30	160	197	113	122
1833 ..	24	110	16	30	166	235	102	132
1834 ..	21	110	16	30	163	263	158	190
1835 ..	26	110	17	30	174	265	134	185
Totals in 7 Years....	151	750	130	360	1129	1457	824	970
Averages	21	107	18	30	161	208	117	138

So that it is apparent, that where board and clothing are given the girls are retained under instruction about five years; when

clothing only is afforded, the boys remain rather more than four years; but where neither of these advantages exist, the fluctuation of the scholars is so great, the succession so rapid, that very little effect comparatively can be produced upon their minds. We do not offer this statement as a conclusive proof that national schools are of little use. On the contrary, if the state of the people is such that they will be so unsteady in the training up of their offspring, it is of the greatest possible consequence that the children should, for a time, however short it be, undergo the training and discipline of an institution of this kind; and though the succession upon an average is so great, there are many who remain a considerable time (three or four years) at school. We think, however, that the statement shows that charity schools are of infinitely greater use in forming the character of children than the advocates for large schools commonly suppose.

This view of educational concerns may be new to some of our readers, but it ought not to be new to Lord Brougham. In proof of this assertion, and in confirmation of what we hold to be a most important fact as to the succession of children in large schools, the following extracts are made from the Education Committee in 1816:—

“First Report.—Education of Lower Orders.”

p. 2.—“T. A. Finnegan, master of the St. Giles’s Irish Free Schools, had had 774 boys during three years received into his school, there being, on an average, 200 upon the books at one time; *i. e.*, the school changed its scholars nearly four times in three years.

p. 101.—“In the Horseferry Road School, under C. F. Jameson, from 16th Jan. 1815 till 1st June, 1816, there were 413 boys admitted, the average attendance being 180.

p. 122.—“In the Spitalfields School, which Mr. W. Allen said would hold 800, on an average only 320 attended; and from 1812 till June, 1816, the school actually *educated* 2000 children.

p. 185.—“Mr. Pickton, the master of the Borough Road School, said that the institution, up to June, 1816, had been the means of *educating* at least 12,000 children,” *i. e.* this number had passed through the school.

“Second Report.”

p. 33.—“In Shadwell School, Mr. J. Fletcher said that there had been 948 admissions within two years, there being on an average 434 children on the books.”

5. After all, however, the grand objection which we entertain against the formation of the new commission, is founded upon its direct opposition to the principle of non-interference, which the 4th resolution pretends to set at rest. The opposition which we mean, is so perfectly manifest to our understanding, and yet so

carefully concealed from public view, that we have more than once felt a suspicion cross in our minds, lest the noble advocate of the commission were not quite *candid* and *sincere*. When he was pressed, indeed, at the conclusion of his speech, with the importance of religion (which had been suffered to pass without a single observation,) his lordship replied, that *he entirely concurred* in what was said by the Right Reverend Prelates,—“ he was not unaware of the difficulties which surrounded this part of the subject, but he thought he should, at a future time, be able to produce a plan, by which the objections that had been urged would be obviated; and that they might afterwards grapple more successfully with such difficulties.” We had hoped that some acknowledgment of this kind would have been found in the published speech. But not a word is there to intimate an allusion to the subject, or to interfere with the beautiful simplicity of the plan, by which charitable bequests, left very generally by churchmen, from a religious feeling, to be distributed by the clergyman, or the churchwardens, to the poor of the congregation (Church), are to be applied to a system of popular instruction, in connexion with Normal schools, the main and distinguishing character of which is to be that they are to teach the elements (not of Christianity, but) of various sciences to the poor. His lordship’s opinions and wishes on this subject cannot be mistaken. They are in print, in the Education Committee’s Report (June 1818), and they were repeated deliberately in his lordship’s evidence last year (Quest. 2830). The burden of the scheme is this, that we must provide equally for all; and “in places where only one school can be supported, it is manifest that any regulations which exclude dissenters, deprive the poor of that body of all means of education.” That is to say, that the schools are to be divested of their present religious character;—that between the Normal Institutions and the Commissioners, a great regeneration is to take place, and in the course of a few years, they are to be adapted to the scientific age in which we live. So then, his lordship brings us round at last to fight a battle again, on a field where we fought before. This religious bearing of the subject was precisely the matter at issue between the National and Lancastrian Societies some twenty-five years ago. Nothing short of a directly religious education would satisfy the former; nothing which was called exclusive or sectarian was permitted in the system of the latter party. The friends of the latter system desired that schools in general should be conducted upon this plan; their champion now modestly demands that the charitable endowments of the country should be available for their support.

The plan of Normal schools, we regard, in one way, as a

pernicious interference with the existing state of things; not because it would raise the abilities of the teachers, but because it would give authority to teachers who do not of necessity possess the religious qualifications which are indispensable, who, from the nature of their training, must consider religion as a secondary affair in the business of a school,—and we protest against the misappropriation of endowments here contemplated for reasons of a similar kind. Those funds would be made auxiliary, in a remote and indirect manner, to the objects which they were especially designed to advance. Violence would be done to the consciences of the living and the intentions of the deceased, and instead of helping forward the cause of charity, an effectual stop would be put to that spirit of piety and beneficence which has created so vast and noble a body of endowments, which are capable of conferring such important benefits upon the national Church (whose welfare they were meant to promote) by the application of the most moderate share of legislative interference, instead of the most unusual and extreme exertion of power.

We have long seen and examined the system which is at work, and is conducted with no ordinary zeal and skill, in Southwark, and which pretends to *satisfy all religious parties and to interfere with none*. The boast as regards dissenters we believe to be empty and vain. The real Calvinistic party, we are persuaded, do not send their children without scruple to places where religious doctrine is so diluted as to be palatable to the taste of the world at large. There was evidence put on record last year that this is the case. The Unitarians and Socinians distinctly said, by their organ Mr. Wood, (Quest. 2123—7.) that they considered the Borough Road system partial and unjust. But we pretend not to answer for others, we will speak plainly for ourselves. There are *four* items in our account of this matter which we hold to furnish insuperable obstacles to the application of the British system to the wants of the national Church. 1. *It will not admit of teaching any prayer*; the theory but not the practice of prayer is instilled into a child. 2. *It will not allow of any catechism or creed*; and there are many scruples as to explaining what is called a *disputed passage* in the word of God. 3. *It will not brook ministerial interference*; the pastor of the flock, so far from being the principal and ostensible feeder of the lambs, must remain in the back ground, or if he puts forth his hand, must not put it forth as the instrument which God has sanctioned and invested with ministerial authority for the purpose to which it is applied. 4. *It inculcates but does not require the public worship of God*, and this with pupils whose age is such that the Bible tells us they are to be trained and led (not reasoned) into the way that they should go.

Is it possible that the country will submit to such a defective system of religion as this? What can Lord Brougham think are the religious principles of the beneficent persons, whose praises he so often sounds, that they will quietly continue to pay their money for the support of a plan so wanting in every matter which is essential to the churchman's practice and belief?

The answer appears self-evident to us. But it may be called the answer which bigotry, or the bias of a Church, education suggests. Well then, as a concluding argument and a friendly course to adopt, we appeal to the noble peer himself; we mean to that portion of his speech, for which we heartily thank his lordship, where he treats of the natural working of the evil passions, and the absurdity of supposing that any calculation of consequences is made, or any reasoning and intellectual process is going on, when the mind is heated in the pursuit of vice. It is this sound exposition of the delusion occasioned by sin which we hold to be the strength of our cause. No cultivation of the head will ever dispel its seductive charms; nothing will avail but the fundamental change and rectifying of the heart. Habit may do something; not at all what his lordship thinks; but religion, combined with early training, will do all which it is ever permitted us in this world of sin to effect. The doctrines of the gospel, and the Holy Spirit which the gospel promises and offers, are alone sufficient to restore the image of the Creator in that fallen creature, man! Prayer, faith, and the use of means in attending to the ordinances of God, are the only things we recognize as adequate to this end, believing (as we firmly do with his lordship) that the state of our deluded fellow creatures, in their most unhappy circumstances, is touched on with much truth in the following words:—

“I do not say, “Dispense with such penal inflictions;” but I do really and sincerely declare, from the result of my practical experience, and on all the principles which I have ever called to aid me in the inquiry, that the present system of punishment fails so entirely in accomplishing its object, that nothing can be less consolatory to the feelings of him who has to administer criminal justice, or him who presides over the councils required to execute it. It appears to me evident that all who have discussed this question of crime and punishment, have proceeded upon an erroneous supposition. They have all assumed that a person making up his mind about committing an offence against the law is a reasoning, provident, calculating being. They have all argued on the supposition, that a man committing a robbery on the highway, speculates, at the moment of planning his expedition, upon the chance of being hanged for it; or that a man projecting a forgery, is well aware of the punishment which awaits him, and feels a conviction that he shall suffer it. All reasoners on this subject have gone upon the

assumption, that the individuals who commit crimes, calculate beforehand the consequences of their conduct, as the merchant, in his counting-house, reckons on the chances of profit and loss in his speculations. It is equally assumed, that the individual is, at the time of making the supposed calculation, unbiassed and free in his mind—that he considers the subject with calmness and deliberation—in short, that he is altogether in the same frame of mind in which we are ourselves, when devising the punishment for his offences; whereas, he is almost invariably under the influence of strong excitement. The truth is, that men rush on the commission of the greatest crimes, under the dominion of passions which lay their reason prostrate. The greatest of all enormities are almost invariably committed under the influence of mighty excitement. It is the madness of lust, and a rape is perpetrated—or the fury of revenge, and murder is done—or hatred wrought up to frenzy, and houses are burnt or demolished; the stings of conscience being felt after the offence, and in the calm that succeeds the tempest of passion. Even offences of a more sordid kind, those against property, and which are more connected with speculation, are planned with such a desire of obtaining the things sought after, to supply some necessity, or gratify some propensity, that in estimating the risk of detection and punishment, hardly a thought is bestowed on those dangers.”—p. 15, 16.

And what, then, is the remedy which Lord Brougham proposes to apply to the deluded creature who is constrained and carried away in a bondage such as this? How will he meet this derangement of the understanding, which he shows so clearly to result from the derangement of the heart?—By instruction of a more scientific kind?—by sharpening the intellectual powers?—by interesting the child in geography and geometry, or natural history, &c.?—or, does he think that mere habit and custom in early life will do the needful work?—Alas, for the miserable impotency of all such remedies as these! We despise them NOT!—No! we despise no assistances in accomplishing so difficult a task as the improving of our fellow creatures! These methods have their advantages and their proper work to do. But, can we rest satisfied with such helps as these afford?—Is this the sum of our religious conviction, (have we so learned Christ,) that we deem these remedies of primary importance to the cure?—Surely not!—If the disease is in the heart, it is there that the sovereign balm must be applied; and it is the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, in which alone we place our trust. And the voice of the country, we are persuaded, is with us, and will continue to be so, while we make it our first and highest aim to render all our national schools instrumental in conveying the Gospel to the poor.

ART. X.—*A Discourse of Natural Theology*. By Henry Lord Brougham. London, Knight, 1835, 8vo. pp. 296.

THIS volume has somewhat agreeably disappointed us. We opened it, prejudging its merits by our former estimate of its noble author's intellectual and religious peculiarities, and were buckling on our armour for a joust with ill-demonstrated, if not, untrue conclusions, and much unsafe latitudinarian speculation. For, though we concede to Lord Brougham, the praise of rich and varied knowledge, of vast powers of eloquence, of intellectual fervour such as few men of his age possess, yet we have been compelled, unbiassed by political party-spirit, to allege, as an off-set to these great merits, that this knowledge pervaded too vast a field to be on any point profound, whilst his habits of declamation and everlasting bustle unfitted him for cool, dispassionate, cautious logic. And further, we are free to assert that many of his Lordship's deliberately avowed opinions have made us seriously question the soundness of his *religious* views, even on the most general principles of Christianity. His well-known denial of man's accountableness for his belief, in the Inaugural Discourse before the Glasgow University, justified our suspicions. Our readers, therefore, will be sure that we assert it after a most careful and rigid examination,—that the present volume is far more remote from superficial, precipitate argument,—far more free from the slightest shade of scepticism—and on the other hand, though not as profound in its researches, far more deferential in its Christianity, than could have been expected. Notwithstanding its many defects we do unfeignedly admire him for this contribution to religion. We pray God that it may command the attention and convince the judgment of the vast hordes of semi-philosophical or libertine sceptics, that have for years regarded his Lordship as *bonâ fide* their patron in opinions. But while we say this, we cannot withhold our astonishment, that this avowal of his entire adherence not only to Natural but to *Revealed* religion also, has been reserved, (unless it is a recent adherence,) to a period of life, when many who were at first attracted by the witchery of that versatile, energetic power, which distinguished his liberalism, have wandered into the pathless depths of error, and are some, through death, and many through obtuseness, irrecoverable.

"This Discourse is not a Treatise of Natural Theology; it has not for its design an exposition of the doctrines whereof Natural Theology consists. But its object is, first to explain the nature of the evidence upon which it rests—to show that it is a science, the truths of which are discovered by induction, like the truths of Natural and Moral

Philosophy, that it is a branch of science partaking of the nature of each of those great divisions of human knowledge, and not merely closely allied to them both. Secondly, the object of the Discourse is to explain the advantages attending this study. The work therefore is a Logical one."—pp. 6, 7.

The reasons, which induced his Lordship to the composition of this Discourse, are somewhat interesting. He had observed, amongst many men of philosophical pursuits, a prejudice against Natural Theology, that it was only a fancy or speculation, and not a body of truths, as legitimately deduced from physical and moral facts, as any of their own favourite sciences. With a laudable anxiety to remove this prejudice, he has undertaken to show the contrary.

We shall first put our readers in possession of a brief epitome of his Lordship's arguments, and reserve the conclusion of this article for some remarks upon a few of their particular excellences and defects.

All the fundamental truths of physical and mental science depend for their proofs, upon the indirect evidence of induction from things which our senses *directly* perceive, to those which they do not. We observe the prismatic distinction of the seven colours, the effect of their partial or total absence, in proportioned darkness, and of their partial or entire presence, in proportioned light. We mark distinct impressions on our own nerves, or perceive among external objects, one expanded, another liquified, and a third decomposed, and we infer the existence of an all-pervading, all-permeating element, which we call *heat*. Moreover, from the phenomena of thought, of reasoning, of fancy, we conclude that there is that invisible agent which we call *mind*. Of the existence of none of these, either of light, or of heat, or of mind, have we any intuitive proof: our knowledge of them is relative. But this knowledge is derived from the severest induction: from an order of investigation so satisfactory, that, upon the refusal to admit it, universal Pyrrhonism *must* follow.

The intermediate steps of this process of reasoning must be remembered. Through the sense of vision a sensation is excited in the mind: it immediately infers that this sensation must have been excited by something, that it must have had a cause. Its belief that this cause is external, and that it is at a distance from the organ of vision, must also be additional inferences of reasoning.

Now this characteristic of induction being fully understood, we proceed to notice, that up to a certain point, the facts from which we infer the truths of physical and metaphysical science,

are the very same facts as those from which we infer the truths of Natural Theology. The natural theologian, as well as the natural philosopher, grounds his science upon the phenomena, that the eye refracts light, converges it to a focus upon the retina, by the peculiar combination of its lenses corrects "the indistinctness which would otherwise arise from the different refrangibility of light." The natural theologian, as well as the natural philosopher, infers, that the eye is perfectly adapted to the properties of light; that, if its formation was in the least different, if instead of refracting it reflected light, or, if one lens was wanting; or if light was irrefrangible, it could not see. Now, up to this point, the investigations of both are co-ordinate: but when the natural theologian proceeds still further, when, from the fact of the eye's adaptation to the properties of light, he concludes that "the instrument so successfully performing a given service by means of this curious structure, must have been formed with a knowledge of the properties of light," we contend that he still adheres to as severe a process of induction.

Many other phenomena, equally illustrative of adaptation, might be adduced. The eyes of various species of animals differ, as the media of their perception differ: the prowler by night is furnished with a pupil capable of extraordinary dilation: the eye of the amphibious partakes of the eye of the quadruped and the fish: all the exterior apparatus for cleaning the other being unnecessary in fishes, is dismissed; whilst that of the crab, especially the species which lies in the mud, is furnished with a particular provision. So, to turn to other anatomical arrangements:—the mechanism of the leg of the ostrich, to produce velocity of movement; the web-foot of the water-fowl; the structure of the head of the porpoise,—all these display equally accurate adaptations. Moreover, the balanced forces of the planetary system, which gives it stability; or the recent discoveries of the minutiae of osteology, these, in more intangible sciences, nevertheless, exemplify the theory of adaptation:—Now,

"the question which the theologian always puts upon each discovery of a purpose manifestly accomplished, is this: 'Suppose I had this operation to perform by mechanical means, and were acquainted with the laws of regulating the action of matter, should I attempt it in any other way than I here see practised?' If the answer is in the negative, the consequence is irresistible, that some power, capable of acting with design, and possessing the supposed knowledge, employed the means which we see used. But this negative answer is the result of reasoning founded upon induction, and rests upon the same evidence whereon the doctrines of all physical science are discovered and believed. And the inference to which that negative answer so inevitably leads, is a truth in Natural

'Theology ; for it is only another way of asserting, that design and knowledge are evinced in the works and functions of nature.'—pp. 32, 33.

In the third section, Lord Brougham passes from the physical to the metaphysical department, and argues, that, in the constitution of the mind, there are equally striking evidences of adaptation. He asserts that mind, as a separate function of our being, is admirably fitted for its various purposes of acquiring and communicating knowledge. In the structure of its faculties of reasoning and attention ; in the helps provided for it by its powers of curiosity, of association, of habit : in the laws of memory, in the beneficial provision of the feelings of love, of hope, of fear, of anger, of contempt ; it furnishes the inductive philosopher with phenomena, from which as conclusive a truth for Natural Theology may be gathered, as from the most valuable phenomena in physics.

As a favourable specimen of his Lordship's style,—we cannot refrain from submitting to our readers the following summary of the argument upon this topic:—

“ Thus far we have been considering the uses to which the mental faculties and feelings are subservient, and their admirable adaptation to these ends. But view the intellectual world as a whole, and surely it is impossible to contemplate without amazement the extraordinary spectacle which the mind of man displays, and the immense progress which it has been able to make in consequence of its structure, its capacity, and its propensities, such as we have just been describing them. If the brightness of the heavenly bodies, the prodigious velocity of their motions, their vast distances and mighty bulk, fill the imagination with awe, there is the same wonder excited by the brilliancy of the intellectual powers—the inconceivable swiftness of thought—the boundless range which our fancy can take—the vast objects which our reason can embrace. That we should have been able to resolve the elements into their more simple constituents—to analyse the subtle light which fills all space—to penetrate from that remote particle in the universe, of which we occupy a speck, into regions infinitely remote—ascertain the weight of bodies at the surface of the most distant worlds—investigate the laws that govern their motions, or mould their forms—and calculate to a second of time the periods of their re-appearance during the revolution of centuries,—all this is in the last degree amazing, and affords much more food for admiration than any of the phenomena of the material creation. Then what shall we say of that incredible power of generalization which has enabled some even to anticipate by ages the discovery of truths the farthest removed above ordinary apprehension, and the most savouring of improbability and fiction—not merely of a Clairaut conjecturing the existence of a seventh planet, and the position of its orbit, but of a Newton learnedly and sagaciously inferring, from the refraction of light, the inflammable quality of the diamond, the composition of apparently the simplest of the elements, and the opposite nature of the two ingredients, unknown

for a century after, of which it is composed? Yet there is something more marvellous still in the processes of thought, by which such prodigies have been performed, and in the force of the mind itself, when it acts wholly without external aid, borrowing nothing whatever from matter, and relying on its own powers alone. The most abstruse investigations of the mathematician are conducted without any regard to sensible objects; and the helps he derives in his reasonings from material things at all, are absolutely insignificant, compared with the portion of his work which is altogether of an abstract kind—the aid of figures and letters being only to facilitate and abridge his labour, and not at all essential to his progress. Nay, strictly speaking, there are no truths in the whole range of the pure mathematics which might not, by possibility, have been discovered and systematized by one deprived of sight and touch, or immured in a dark chamber, without the use of a single material object. The instrument of Newton's most sublime speculations, the *calculus* which he invented, and the astonishing systems reared by its means, which have given immortality to the names of Euler, Lagrange, Laplace, all are the creatures of pure abstract thought, and all might, by possibility, have existed in their present magnificence and splendour, without owing to material agency any help whatever, except such as might be necessary for their recording and communication. These are, surely, the greatest of all the wonders of nature, when justly considered, although they speak to the understanding and not to the sense. Shall we, then, deny that the eye could be made without skill in optics, and yet admit that the mind could be fashioned and endowed without the most exquisite of all skill, or could proceed from any but an intellect of infinite power?"—p. 68—71.

To the inference that there exists design in the natural and moral world, an addition of great importance remains to be made. The whole reasoning assumes that there is a being separate from and independent of matter, which we call *mind*, who thus adapts means to the end. For we thus argue, if I had to accomplish this purpose, *I*—that is, *my mind*—should use this means. We therefore infer, that the agency which does employ this adaptation is an *intelligence* incomparably more powerful and skilful than ourselves, it is true, but, as our mind, alike separate from, independent of matter.

Hitherto, in our investigation, we have confined ourselves to the argument *à posteriori*. But it is not to be overlooked that many writers of *Natural Theology* have employed the reverse instrument, the argument *à priori*. Lord Brougham devotes the fourth section to an examination of its merits,—chiefly in a criticism of Dr. Clarke's *Demonstration of the Being and attributes of God*. His Lordship in the first place supposes that this *Demonstration* is a genuine *à priori* argument; in that case, if it is possible to prove the existence and attributes of the Deity, wholly independent of facts, it must be because they are necessary and

not contingent Truths. It would not only be impossible for the Deity *not* to exist, but impossible for his attributes to be any others than those of goodness and benevolence which the argument *à priori* supposes them to be. But they are not necessary truths to this extent; their contraries are not wholly inconceivable: there is nothing at all contradictory in the idea of the Creator of the world being mixed in goodness and limited in power. This is the Noble Author's first position. But to advert to particulars: the boasted argument *à priori* is not a genuine one. Dr. Clarke assumes the existence of space and time or duration, which he affirms to be the qualities of an infinite Eternal Being. But space and time are not qualities.—“What, for example, is time but the succession of ideas and the consciousness and the recollection which we have of that succession? To call it a quality is absurd: as well might we call motion a quality, or our ideas of absent things and persons a quality.”—And although we allowed space to be a quality, if infinite space is a quality of an infinite Being, finite space is a quality, and must be the quality, of a finite being.—Of what Being?—In an exhausted receiver of what being is the space included in a square of one foot a quality? Again, though all these considerations be abandoned;—though space and duration are allowed to be qualities,—whence do we gain our ideas of them? *à priori*? or from experience? All will admit their origin from the latter: then any argument in which these ideas are admissible *must* be more or less a species of inductive reasoning: and the claim which this demonstration makes as discoverable by reasoning merely, is untrue.

Lord Brougham proceeds in the next chapter to assert, that natural theology has its moral, or ethical, as well as its physical and psychological departments. It treats of “the probable designs of the Deity with respect to the future destiny of his creatures.” Here also induction is the logical instrument by which those designs are to be ascertained. The nature of the human mind, and the attributes of the Creator, are the phenomena or sources of this induction. In the first place, from the nature of the human mind, which can be shown to be *immaterial*—separate from and independent of matter—by the strictest induction it can be proved to be *immortal*. If the mind consists of material parts—if it is any modification of matter—if it is inseparably connected with any particular combination of matter—then its destruction of course follows upon the destruction of the body. But the mind does not consist of material parts, taking them merely in a mass, irrespectively of their arrangement; the most thorough materialist never adopted such a theory. No more can it be proved that it is the result of any modification

of those parts; for all experience, all analogy is against it. "We know of no case in which the combination of certain elements produces something quite different, not only from each of the simple ingredients, but also different from the whole compound." And further, the velocity of the mind's movements; the phenomena of dreams, in which all those bodily functions which depend upon volition are suspended; its marked independence during a certain period of man's life of his bodily changes,—“for it is an undoubted fact, and almost universally true, that the mind, before extreme old age, becomes more sound, and is capable of greater things, during nearly thirty years of diminished bodily powers;” its identity from infancy to death, during which interval the body is constantly undergoing change in all its parts,—these facts are phenomena, from which follows the inductive truth, that the existence of the mind is entirely independent of the existence of the body, and will most probably survive it. The conclusion that the dissolution of the soul was consequent upon the dissolution of the body, would be at variance with all inductive philosophy.

But the attributes of the Deity furnish us with additional means of investigating the ethical truths of natural theology. The attribute of divine goodness has been already deduced “from the great preponderance of instances in which benevolent design is exhibited” in the physical phenomena; and the *probability* of the soul's immortality has been also deduced. It becomes certain, when we observe the intense longings after immortality which are universally experienced, and which it is impossible to conceive a benevolent being would implant, if he did not intend to gratify them, together with the unequal distribution of rewards and punishments, which can in no way be so consistently reconciled with the scheme of a benevolent Providence as by the supposition of a future state. In conclusion,

“it remains to observe, that all the speculations upon which we have touched under this second subdivision of the subject, the moral argument, are similar to the doctrines of inductive science, at least, to such of those doctrines as are less perfectly ascertained; but the investigation is conducted upon the same principles. The most satisfactory proofs of the soul's immortality are those of the first, or psychological class, derived from studying the nature of mind; those of the second class, which we have last been surveying, derived from the condition of man in connexion with the attributes of the Deity, are less distinct and cogent; nor would they be sufficient of themselves; but they add important confirmation to the others; and both are as truly parts of legitimate inductive science as any branch—we may rather say, any other branch—of moral philosophy.” p. 137.

This section closes all that is essential to his Lordship's argument. The sixth is employed in quotations from Lord Bacon's

works, to show that the father of inductive philosophy, though occasionally betrayed into a general condemnation of inquiries into final causes, did not reprobate, but rather applauded, those which are peculiar to natural theology.

Then follows a discussion of the methods of analysis and synthesis, and their separate bearings upon the present science.

"The second part, which treats of the advantages of the study, consists of three sections.

"The first shows that the precise kind of pleasure derived from the investigation of scientific truths, is derived from this study.

"The second treats of the pleasures which are peculiar to this study.

"The third treats of the connexion of natural with revealed religion."
--p. 14.

The notes are so copious as to occupy half of the volume: one or two of them, chiefly notes IV. V. in refutation of the scepticism in the celebrated "*Système de la Nature*," and in Hume's writings, deserve consideration.

We shall now proceed to offer some remarks upon the general merits of the work, and the argument before us. In the first place, we must assert that, whatever may be the merits of the argument, Lord Brougham cannot claim them. The only points on which he makes any pretensions to originality—such as the evidences of design to be discovered in our mental constitution, and the insufficiency of reasoning *à priori*—have been long since developed. It is far from our wish to undervalue this *Discourse* because it contains no discoveries; but when we find the contributions of others to philosophy unacknowledged, we deem it our sacred duty to unveil them. It is true that Paley's *Natural Theology* confines itself too exclusively to sensible phenomena; and we agree with the Noble Lord that its author's habits of mind unfitted him for any other very abstract department. But because Paley, or Derham, or Ray, neglected the evidences to be gathered from the mind, it does not follow that other writers of natural theology have been equally remiss. Professor Whewell, in his invaluable *Bridgewater Treatise*, and, above all, Barrow, the unrivalled in sacred eloquence and profound reasoning, in his sermon upon "*The Being of God proved from the Frame of Human Nature*," had previously observed them.*

* "To think," says the latter, "a gross body may be ground and pounded into rationality—a slow body may be thumped and driven into passion—a rough body may be filed and polished into a faculty of discerning and resenting things,—that a cluster of pretty, thin round atoms (as Democritus, forsooth, conceived)—that a well mixed combination of elements (as Empedocles fancied)—that a harmonious contemporaneous (or *crasis*) of humours (as Galen, dreaming, it seems, upon his drugs and his potions, would persuade us)—that an implement made up of I know not what fine

In like manner his Lordship's theory of space and duration was, long ago, anticipated by Bishop Butler. In the bishop's third letter to Dr. Clarke, when speaking of the self-existent Deity, he says: "Space is, in one sense, a property of the self-existent substance; but, in the same sense, it is also a property of all other substances." This leading proposition Lord Brougham must have known, especially as it is to be found in one of the very letters to which he refers in his *Discourse*;—it is the chief argument by which he assails the *à priori* theory, and we therefore did expect that its original author would have been acknowledged.

But having thus shown our readers that his merits must be solely as a compiler, we proceed to inquire into the actual worth of the argument itself.

We allow that it is pure legitimate induction. We can imagine no fair exception against the inference from the physical and mental phenomena in the visible universe, that an intelligent, all-wise Being must have arranged them. To this extent the argument *à posteriori* is invaluable. But it has its limits. It must never be forgotten that the source whence it draws its observations is the *visible* system of creation. It is true it embraces the animalcula with its well proportioned limbs and arteries and instincts, as well as the most distant orb whose movements are at all the objects of calculation. Its facts are called from these extreme points, as also from those which intervene. And from these by induction, we conclude that there is a presiding all-governing mind. But do they likewise teach us that though there may be other *unseen* systems, yet still the mind which presides *here* is supreme *there*? They assure us that he

springs and wheels, and such mechanic knacks (as some of our modern wizards have been busy in divining)—should, without more to do, become the subject of so rare capacities and endowments—the author of actions so worthy, and works so wonderful—capable of wisdom and virtue, of knowledge so vast, and of desires so lofty—apt to contemplate truth and affect good—able to recollect things past, and to foresee things future—to search so deep into the causes of things, and disclose so many mysteries of nature—to invent so many arts and sciences—to contrive such projects of policy, and achieve such feats of prowess,—briefly, should become capable to design, undertake, and perform all those admirable effects of human wit and industry which we daily see and hear of,—how senseless and absurd conceits are these! How can we, without great indignation and regret, entertain such suppositions! No, no: it is both ridiculous fondness and monstrous baseness for us to own any parentage from, or any alliance to, things so mean, so very much below us. . . . But let these degenerate men vivify their own nature, and disparage themselves as they please, yet those noble perfections of our soul speak its extraction from a higher stock:—we cannot, if we consider them well, but acknowledge that *mentem e celestium traximus arce*; or, as Epicharmus said of old, that *man's reason did sprout from the Divine reason*; they plainly discover their original to be from a cause, itself understanding and knowing, willing freely, resenting things—(if I may so speak)—and moving of itself in a more excellent manner and degree."

is ever present, all-mighty in *this* portion of the universe: do they infallibly attribute to him unrivalled supremacy in all space, and throughout all duration? How know we from this process of argumentation that there are no other far-distant allotments in existence, in which there are other intelligent presidents, perhaps equal, perhaps superior in their power? How does it teach us that there have not been, that there will not be, other cycles of duration, throughout which predecessors *have*, or successors *may* rule even this very system? Does it satisfy us that the present Governor is not the fellow deputy (if, with profound awe, we may use such language) of many others,—being swayed by a final ultimate cause, who “dwelleth in light,” into whose effulgence no finite reasoning can penetrate? We deny that the *à posteriori* argument, by itself, can deduce the existence of a final, an ultimate cause. There is no absurdity in supposing that universal nature is subdivided into compartments,—over which severally one secondary deputed intelligence presides,—he, himself, guided in his viceroyship by the laws enjoined by the Creator. And this is the last truth which the reasoning before us *can* ascertain. We deny that it can establish either the unity, or the omnipotence, or the omniscience of the ruler of that portion of the universe which is visible to us. As to his unity, it can prove, from the uniformity of nature’s laws, that *one* mind directs them: but it does not prove that there is not another system in which laws the very reverse are recognized. And so likewise of his omnipotence and omniscience:—his knowledge and his power may be perfect *here*, but is it unrivalled, unlimited through infinite space? Nay, more, it does not even establish his unmixed goodness: there may be innumerable other systems; for aught it teaches us, some in their results may be benevolent, others may be malicious: for aught it teaches us, there may be more systems productive of evil, than those which are productive of good. The argument, therefore, when taken alone, is manifestly insufficient.

We are not thus undervaluing induction, or the argument, *à posteriori*, with any design of enhancing the importance of the hypothetical, or *à priori* instrument, so frequently employed by Natural Theologians. We entirely agree with Lord Brougham’s assertion, that inasmuch as the latter presupposes the existence of space and duration, the ideas of which are to be obtained solely from experience; it is, therefore, to say the least, mixed up with some of the conclusions ascertained by the former. But we have even stronger objections against it than his Lordship. We do not see the *logical* force of the following observations:—

“Upon the argument *à priori*, I may remark, that although it carries

us but a very little way, and would be unsafe to build upon alone, it is yet of eminent use in two particulars. First, it illustrates, if it does not indeed prove, the possibility of an infinite Being existing beyond and independent of us and all visible things; and, secondly, the fact of those ideas of immensity and eternity forcing themselves, as Mr. Stewart expresses it, upon our belief, seems to furnish an additional argument for the existence of an Immense and Eternal Being. At least we must admit that excellent person's remark to be well founded, that after we have, by the argument *à posteriori*, (I should rather say the *other parts* of the argument *à posteriori*,) satisfied ourselves of the existence of an intelligent cause, we naturally connect with this cause those impressions which we have derived from the contemplation of infinite space and endless duration; and hence we clothe with the attributes of immensity and eternity, the awful Being whose existence has been proved by a more rigorous process of investigation."—pp. 96, 97.

We say we do not see the *logical* force of these observations. They refer to the regions of imagination and fancy, not of reason; they furnish no proof. What connection is there between "our idea of an intelligent cause, and the attributes of immensity and eternity?" "We naturally connect them" it is said in the last quotation. *Naturally?* What can this mean? Is it a *necessary* relation? We have proved that it is not. Or is it from the innate, instinctive disposition of the human mind? Then the whole argument results in this, that our final proof of the Existence of a supreme Divinity is to be referred to the universal belief of it, which many philosophers have asserted to be comate with the first moments of *our own* conscious existence.

Neither of these trains of reasoning can be said to be by itself satisfactory. The better of the two, the inductive, can only ascertain truths from visible phenomena. It leaves the anxious spirit of a man without any abiding consolation. If the soul feels alarmed at its provocation of that Deity which Natural Theology discovers, it may silence that alarm by the question, How know I but that this Being whom I have offended is not himself obnoxious to a higher tribunal? Or if, on the other hand, it enjoys a consciousness of the favour of that Divinity, its peace may be disturbed by the suspicion, whether his power to reward be controlled by a superior.

Before we come to the general inference with which we shall close this article, and meanwhile entreating our readers to keep in mind the above-mentioned deficiencies of the science of natural theology as it is represented by Lord Brougham, we must advert to another most glaring imperfection in his discourse. One section is devoted to the ethical branch of the science; but will it be believed, that the only *facts* from which the truths of this department are to be ascertained, are those of the innate-

riality of the mind and the divine attribute of goodness? The noble author has entirely overlooked man's *moral* constitution. It is not incumbent on us at present to enter on the discussion, that there are *moral* as well as metaphysical phenomena; that there is in man a conscience as well as will, from which the natural theologian may deduce his truths: for, since this volume before us recognizes the authenticity of Revelation, we are authorized in assuming it to be a principle admitted by his lordship and ourselves, that "there is a law written on man's heart," a law of morals; and, therefore, when he professes to treat of the ethical branch of a science which is based on *facts*, we affirm that an omission of this, not merely important, but absolutely essential one, is unpardonable.

We have at length reached the point at which our readers, who have hitherto favoured us with their attention, will ask:—"Since natural theology leaves us in ignorance of the absolute supremacy, and unity, and omnipotence, and omniscience of the Deity of visible nature, whence *can* we ascertain that he is in possession of such attributes?" We would answer to this inquiry, and proceed to demonstrate it, that Revelation, and Revelation only, gives us the information. We are quite prepared to admit with* Lord Brougham that Revelation *à priori* might not be satisfactory: we mean, that for a supernatural Being to arrogate to himself these attributes, and even to perform miracles in support of his claims, would not be sufficient to demand credence. The miracles would only proclaim his *power*, not his *veracity*. To obtain a belief in his statements, the correlative truths and the purposes of his revelation must be regarded. Should these bear the unquestionable stamp of holiness, and disinterestedness, and love, they would then so irrefragably prove the moral goodness of the revealer as to render the *truth* of all his assertions undoubted. Now this is essentially the character of that blessed

* "Suppose it were shown by incontestible proofs that a messenger sent immediately from heaven had appeared on the earth;—suppose, to make the case more strong against our argument, that this messenger arrived in our own days, nay appeared before our eyes, and showed his divine title to have his message believed, by performing miracles in our presence. No one can by possibility imagine a stronger case; for it excludes all arguments upon the weight or the fallibility of testimony; it assumes all the ordinary difficulties in the way of revelation to be got over. Now, even this strong evidence would not at all establish the truth of the doctrine promulgated by the messenger; for it would not show that the story he brought was worthy of belief in any one particular except his supernatural powers. These would be demonstrated by his working miracles. All the rest of his statement would rest on his assertion. But a being capable of working miracles might very well be capable of deceiving us. The possession of power does not of necessity exclude either fraud or malice. This messenger might come from an evil as well as from a good being; he might come from more beings than one; or he might come from one being of many existing in the universe."—pp. 205, 206.

Revelation, which possesses the external evidences of miracles and prophecy, and more than all, the internal evidence arising from its moral affinities with our spiritual condition. The believer in Christianity, then, is not only persuaded that it came from a supernatural, but also from a perfectly *good* being. But veracity is an element of goodness; when he, therefore, declares that he is "the only living and true God," that he is the Almighty, and arrogates to himself these attributes at the very same moment that he proclaims mercy as the result of a vast expenditure of his love; at the same time that he disperses baleful sorrow from the heart, and introduces the peace "of righteousness," of virtue; surely there can remain no feasible suspicion of the authenticity of the first part of his statement, any more than of the other.

That such an inference is legitimate Lord Brougham, at least, cannot dispute; for his lordship has reasoned in the same way, though for the support of the contrary opinion.

"It deserves, however, to be remarked in perfect consistency with the argument which has here been maintained, that no mere revelation, no direct message, however avouched by miraculous gifts, could prove the faithfulness of the promises held out by the messenger, excepting by the slight inference which the nature of the message might afford. The portion of his credentials, which consisted of his miraculous powers, could not prove it. For, unless we had first ascertained the unity and the benevolence of the being that sent him, as those miracles only prove power, he might be sent to deceive us; and thus the hopes held out by him might be delusions. The doctrines of natural religion here come to our aid, and secure our belief to the messenger of one being, whose goodness they have taught us to trust."—pp. 208, 209.

Now if natural religion did convey to us such certainty, this reasoning would be sufficient: but we trust that our readers have been already convinced to the contrary. Revealed religion cannot derive this assistance from it, neither does she require it.

We shall add but one remark more upon the too subordinate position which we think Lord Brougham has assigned to Revelation. These are his own words.

"Upon the particulars of a future state—the kind of existence reserved for the soul—the species of its occupations and enjoyments—Natural Theology is, of course, profoundly silent; but not more silent than Revelation. We are left wholly to conjecture, and in a field on which our hopelessness of attaining any certain result is quite equal to our interest in the success of the search. Indeed, all our ideas of happiness in this world are such as rather to disqualify us for the investigation, or what may more fitly be termed the imagination. Those ideas are, for the most part, either directly connected with the senses, or derived from our condition of weakness here which occasions the formation

of connections for mutual comfort and support, and gives to the feebler party the feeling of allegiance, to the stronger the pleasure of protection. Yet may we conceive that, hereafter, such of our affections as have been the most cherished in life shall survive and form again the delight of meeting those from whom death has severed us—that the soul may enjoy the purest delights in the exercise of its powers, above all, for the investigation of truth—that it may expatiate in the full discovery of whatever has hitherto been most sparingly revealed, or most carefully hidden from its view—that it may be gratified with the sight of the useful harvest reaped by the world from the good seed which it helped to sow. We can only conjecture or fancy. But these, and such as these, are pleasures in which the gross indulgences of sense have no part, and which are even removed above the less refined of our moral gratifications: they may, therefore, be supposed consistent with a pure and faultless state of spiritual being.”—pp. 133—135.

We do not hesitate to say that this theory is dangerous. We cannot learn from Revelation the localities, or the physical laws, or the specific employments which will distinguish our future condition. But it throws a fatal vagueness over the Divine Word to say that Revelation is as silent upon the whole subject as natural theology. “We know not what we shall be,”—we know not through what sublimation our raised bodies must previously be made to pass; we know not the principles which will regulate our intercommunion with our fellows, or with intelligences of higher grades; we know not how the soul will enjoy the beatific vision of the eternal, how man shall see God’s face and live. These are conditions upon which neither analogy nor experience can inform us: nevertheless we are not left in total darkness: “The day star hath arisen in our hearts:” Life and immortality have been brought to *light* by the Gospel. Of the moral distinctions of a glorified hereafter, we are assured; they have even “cast their shadows before,” in spiritual emotions, which Revelation calls forth, even here,—the love of Christ as the master passion; joy in the eternal’s unsullied favour; the perfect harmony of man’s faculties and affections; perpetual advance in knowledge;—all these, and more than these, are specified in Revelation. But has natural religion assured us of as much? We might pursue this comparison on the more painful topic of an accursed immortality; but we forbear. We only wish to correct a very improper mis-statement; and we pass on.

It must not be thought that we undervalue natural theology. Far from it: we would strenuously exhort to its cultivation: for it has its uses. It proves the existence of a Deity, whose power and knowledge in the system visible to us, and of which we form a part, supreme and unlimited. It proclaims his wisdom. It thence awakens profound anxiety in the mind to know

his will. It is thus the handmaid of Revelation. As was the law in introducing the Gospel "shutting them up to the faith that should afterwards be revealed," it may be made subservient likewise. And that its assistance is not to be disdained, is evident from apostolical example. It was the mode by which Paul arrested the attention of the Athenians, when having first aroused them to an apprehension of the Deity,—he on vantage-ground adduced that Deity's command to all men everywhere to repent and believe the Gospel.

Our limits will not suffer us to select any other topics of discussion, though there are very many that require it. From what we have stated, it will be seen that the discourse is far from one which might have been expected from Lord Brougham's talents;—it is much better than might have been expected from his time.

It is the first of five volumes which are to be entitled "*Paley's Natural Theology illustrated*." Sir Charles Bell will co-operate with his Lordship in the subsequent ones; and on their appearance we may again call our readers to the subject.

ART.—XI. *Letters on the Necessity of a National Church*. By the Rev. Charles Cator. Baldwin and Cradock.

2. *A National Church vindicated; in refutation of a Petition from the Dissenters of Glasgow to Earl Grey. Part I. The necessity of an Established Church farther vindicated, wherever the existence of an Omnipotent Deity is believed. Part II.* London: Parbury, Allen and Co. 1835.

3. *The Church's Self-Regulating Privilege, a National Safeguard in respect of real Church Reform; or, Reasons for reviving Convocations, or restoring Provincial and Diocesan Synods.* By John Kempthorne, B.D., Rector of St. Michael's, Gloucester. London: J. Hatchard and Son. 1835.

4. *Twenty-one Sermons on Various Subjects, adapted to the Present Time.* By the Rev. Jacob Henry Brooke Mountain, M.A. Prebendary of Lincoln, Rector of Blunham, Bedfordshire, Vicar of Hemel Hempstead, Herts, and Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester. London: Rivingtons: Cambridge: Deighton. 1835.

5. *Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions, in the Promotion of Sound Religious Knowledge, occasioned by Lord Henley's Plan for their Abolition.* By Edward Bouverie Pusey, B.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church, late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Roake and Varty. 1835.

6. *Proposals for a Reformation of the Church of England, in a Letter to a Friend about to Secede from that Communion.* London: James Ridgway and Sons, Piccadilly. 1835.
7. *An Address to the Curates of the Church of England, on the subject of Church Reform.* By a Clergyman of the Establishment. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1835.
8. *Practical Hints on Church Reform.* By a Churchman. London: James Fraser. 1835.
9. *A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell.* By a Beneficed Clergyman of the Protestant Church of Ireland. London: James Ridgway and Sons. 1835.
10. *Sermon by the Rev. H. H. Norris, preached in the Church of South Hackney.* Rivington and Wise.

"To be, or not to be?"—that is really, it seems, the question which many would raise with respect to the Church Establishment. Others would hardly regard the matter yet as one of life and death; but would be content to save by amputation. We, who are not quite so slashing and desperate in our intentions, would nevertheless urge no objection to any treatment whatever, which should fairly promise to be wholesome and sanatory. However, as it is far easier to lop than to reinstate, to sever than to join, a wise man will never have recourse to violent operations, and perilous, because violent, until their necessity is proved.

But let us proceed in a more regular way, to consider the opinions and expectations as to Church reform, or Church destruction, of different classes among the people. To perform this part of our business thoroughly would be an interminable task; for the population of the empire is by no means composed of homogeneous materials. We can only attend to classes of men, and we will proceed from the extremes. There are some few, who, like Mr. Owen, would have no religion; that is, who would administer the affairs of this world, both public and private, without reference to another. There are others, who would have no church; that is, who would have no communion of religionists of any description, but would leave a man's religious obligations to his individual conscience, without any formalities of social or united devotion. There are others, who would have no *established* church; that is, who deprecate all connection between the church and the state,—we will not say, between men as they are Christians, and men as they are citizens,—as being an iniquitous, unholy abomination, fatal to the purity of religion, and adverse to the repose of civil government. There is a fourth class, composed of persons, who, without denouncing all church establishment in the abstract, would place them on a broader or a looser

basis, because they think, with Dr. Arnold, that a temple dedicated to the national worship of Almighty God ought to accommodate the Christian worshippers of the nation without reference to sects or parties, and be an open place, like an Eastern Caravansera, where all men may find rest and shelter, and provide themselves, in turn, with the spiritual entertainment suited to their taste : or else, would make them subject to perpetual revision and correction, because they think, with Dr. Hampden, that articles of faith must of necessity be alterable with the progression of knowledge. Others, yet again, without objecting to any fundamental principle of our present establishment, would yet remodel many details in its constitution, and welcome changes more or less extensive, in the amount or the distribution of its revenues—in its mode of patronage—in its internal discipline—in its doctrines and in its formularies. There are others, lastly, whose unchangeable and paramount desire is “*stare super vias antiquas*,” and who deprecate all innovations whatsoever, because they never expect to see an end, if there is once a commencement.

The motives which impel these different classes are as various as their opinions. Some are actuated by spiritual convictions, and some by political jealousy; some by conscientious scruples, and some by malignant rancour; some by a love of novel theories, because the principal feature in their characters is a speculative rashness or dreaminess; some by predatory hopes, because they are the very children of plunder and rapine; and some, of course, by a mixture of several of these incitements, in proportions diversified by a multiplicity of circumstances, and even changing, perhaps, from day to day.

It is quite evident, that men, whose moral complexion is of so many hues, cannot, properly, be regarded in the same light, or treated in the same system. Some, without dishonest or questionable compromise, we might at least endeavour to meet and conciliate : others we have only to encounter in fair battle, desiring nothing more than a clear stage and no favour.

As to infidels, for instance, and their opposition to the church, we must combat infidelity itself, before we can ever vanquish their hostility to the Ecclesiastical establishments of the land. As to others, again, who are not declared foes to the creed of the gospel, our anticipations are far from sanguine, because we know that the real objections go much deeper than the avowed; and, if the empire could settle down with harmony and happiness into a Church of England Christianity to-morrow, the revolutionary agitators would be only more discontented, because placed at a still greater distance from the attainment of their object.

appointed without reference to intellectual or moral desert, as thick round our cathedrals, and as useless, as the jack-daws that fly about them :—these things are obvious marks for the arrows of sarcasm and rebuke. But who defends these things? who wishes to see them introduced or perpetuated? And are they, in point of fact, now visible in the Church? On the other side, we scruple not to say, there is an extreme which is still worse. We can at least conceive a scheme of complete equalization; we can conceive the country cut, for ecclesiastical purposes, into small sections, with the revenues of a Church divided by the number of parishes or districts, and apportioned to their various ministers in equal shares; so that young men of four or five and twenty would jump at once into an incumbency, without the preliminary training and teaching which a curacy must give—for who could afford to keep a curate?—become masters without apprenticeship—directors and guides, when they require discipline and restraint; and finding in the Church something analogous to the condition of an army, in which there should be no generals and no colonels, no lieutenants and no ensigns, but all captains, receiving their company with their commission,—seeing below them no inferior grade, and nothing above them to which they should aspire :—we can conceive these ministers chosen by their congregation, and removeable if they should not happen upon trial to give satisfaction to the majority of their members, or entirely dependent upon persons who should have it in their power to *stop the supplies*, or provide them for only three months :—or we can conceive laymen invested with a legal and indefinite right to build places for the established worship when and where they might wish, and by whatever motives they might be actuated; thus acquiring, perhaps, a pecuniary interest in opposition to the minister of the parish, and sliding, almost of necessity, into an opposition of doctrine; and then we should have the finished specimen, the consummation and climax—of what?—of a torn, disorganized, distracted, miserable Church, without learning, without authority, floundering about in all the extravagances of doctrine, with an entire absence of order and good government. It is to us abundantly clear, that the very climax of *pessimism* would be reached by an equalized level of income and station—the popular election of ministers,—and the unlimited increase of proprietary chapels, not subject to the present ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

But it may be said that we are here only scaring ourselves with the bugbear of our own imaginations; for that projects so absurd have never been contemplated; that even the Mary-le-bone Committee repudiates them; and that, although some approximation to these principles may be deemed desirable, no rational being

has ever dreamt of pursuing them to so preposterous a length. The question, then, becomes one of degree. Where is the golden mean to be found between the two extremes?

Certainly it is not to be found in the many projects which have lately crowded upon us almost in the same drove. For instance, we have "*Practical*" (certainly not *practicable*) "*Hints on Church Reform.*" According to this scheme, the whole land is to be nicely divided, like a sliced cake, into districts, each containing not more than 3000 souls, with two clergymen attached to it; any individual is to build a chapel where he pleases, and to have "the right of presentation;" all sorts of fees are to be abolished, although we cannot see how the multitudinous army of clergymen could afford the sacrifice; and the number of bishops is to be *tripled*, "the funds of the cathedrals and collegiate churches (after providing for the due performance of their services) being appropriated" (to how many more purposes are these wonderful, and, we must suppose, quite inexhaustible funds to be appropriated?) "to the support of the additional bishoprics."

We have already mentioned the delegated correspondent of "*The Record*," that glorious specimen of the clergymen of the Church of England. We would now say, "*qui Bavium non odit*"—may turn for edification to "*An Address to the Curates, &c., by a Clergyman of the Establishment,*" where he may find remarks almost as charitable, and suggestions almost as salutary and practicable; or he may proceed to the "*Proposals for a Reformation of England,*" written (and not without some acuteness and power of style) by Matthew Bridges, who holds some opinions which, as he says, "*to avoid a periphrasis, are generally denominated Exangelical.*" He is the very Beverley of the Isis. Then, after having cleansed the Augean stable of Oxford, he proposes to make short work with the bishops. He settles point after point in a fine, slashing, cavalier style, the petty matters of Church Reform appearing to give no sort of trouble to the magnanimous mind of Matthew Bridges.

We might refer, again, to "*The State of Politics in 1835,*" in which the writer assures us that "*the Exangelical Clergy are longing for Reform,*" while the High Church bigots oppose it; and is "*ironing*" (as Lord Byron used to say) Lord Durham so much as to talk of "*the prospect of his being called to the premiership*"—or, yet again, to a Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, in which we are told things almost more strange and more provocative of a smile, in the midst of melancholy astonishment.

And here, though our own opinions have been stated, yet we feel that our very position may expose us to the charge of inconsistency; because we stand between those, on the one side, who

make the popular volition their law, and the spirit of the age their dictator and arbiter; and those, on the other side, who count the temper of the times as nothing, or rather as a disturbing force, which is in every case to be resisted; and therefore, from the very swayings and fluctuations of the struggle, we may seem sometimes to be mixed up with the former class of sentiments, and sometimes to lean towards the latter. We cannot help these things; and we must bear patiently the consequences which may result from them; knowing that, whether we are right or wrong, we are at least honest; and trusting that, by the fair conflict of thought and the temperate statement of opinions, the beautiful issues of truth and good will be elicited at last.

Let, we say, public inspection be close and sleepless; let the public press do its best and its worst;—let the full beams of discussion shine through every crevice, and perforate every chink and cranny of the establishment;—let it be watched jealously—we care not how jealously—by the vigilance of Christian observation, and even by the “barbarian eye” of infidel dislike:—these things may be useful; and we do not hold them to be formidable. Our judgment, not less than our feelings, revolts from the false and fatal policy of disguise, or suppression, or concealment. We believe boldness to be prudence; because, if the truth be known, the Church has nothing to fear. A calm but firm determination of tone, and a resolution unshrinkingly, but not uncharitably, to approach every question, and to contest every principle, which affects the welfare of the Church, are alone required, we honestly believe, to expose misrepresentations, to hurl back obloquy, to tear the fallacies of our antagonists in pieces, and scatter them to the four winds.

We behold, indeed, in a sound and active state of public opinion the great safeguard, under Almighty Providence, of the Church, as of all other institutions. General corruption we utterly deny; and to place it, whether regarded as a spiritual communion, or as an establishment connected with the state, in a broad and a strong light, is the sure way to prevent particular abuses from creeping in under cover of darkness. The *desideratum* even in temporal concerns—for in spiritual matters no one dares yet to talk of material alterations—is, we are persuaded, not a radical and fundamental change, but a continuance of the present system, adapted to the exigencies of the times and the increase in the numbers of the people, and improved in certain respects by a more vigorous and efficient administration. We should be glad to see some reforms, and we have stated what they are; but we entirely deprecate on all possible grounds, religious, moral, political, social, any rash and sacrilegious projects to recast the eccle-

siastical establishment of England in a new mould;—any absurd attempts at complete equalization, which must become the most injurious inequality, because the most monstrous disproportion; any squared or rounded uniformity, to be purchased at far too dear a price, if purchased at the expense of common justice; any clerical adjustments, made without a paramount necessity, which would laugh to scorn the rights of property and the plain intention of private bequests. In many of these views we are supported by some of the publications prefixed to this article. It is hardly for us to praise the vigorous and admirable sermon of Mr. Norris, of Hackney. Mr. Cator's Letters are in many respects valuable, as also the work intitled "A national Church vindicated." The discourses of Mr. Mountain contain much that is particularly applicable to the present times. By their freshness and their scholarship, they are far removed from the weary and dreary region of common-place. We should have been glad, therefore, to have seen stated the precise audience to which they were severally addressed, in order to form a more correct judgment as to the good taste and propriety of the style of composition. In the first sermon, for instance, we have quotations inserted in the body of the discourse, not merely from Tertullian, Ignatius, and Polycarp, but from Lucan, Terence, and Aristophanes; so that we find Christian fathers, and heathen poets, and even comic writers, mingled in a justa-position, which to themselves at least must have been very unexpected. At the same time, from the range of ideas and the vigour of language, Mr. Mountain's volume is very advantageously distinguished from the average of publications through which it is our business to wade. It consists of clever, learned, argumentative, logical addresses, free from sickly cant and declamatory turbulence; but too abstruse, we think, or rather, perhaps, too classical, for the common uses of parochial ministration. The last sermon, we are constrained to add, is altogether fanciful, instead of devotional; and its effect could only be to excite the superstitious, and set the mind of hearers in general galloping after ghost-stories. By the way, as our text is Church Reform, we were sorry to see so many titles appended to Mr. Mountain's name. The matter, we dare say, may admit of explanation; yet, at the first glance, when we read the words "*Prebendary*," "*Rector*," "*Vicar*," "*Domestic Chaplain*," in Lincolnshire, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Gloucestershire, the impression strikes us that a man must possess a marvellous ubiquity, who can belong to four counties at once, and undertake the performance of four clerical duties. Such a pluralist, it would almost seem, ought to have the power of multiplying or pluralizing himself, and to be something more than "Cerberus, or three

gentlemen in one." The following extracts, however, are well worthy of attention.

"There is yet sufficient good sense and religious sentiment in England to render our establishment the object of general attachment and veneration; the guide of public opinion; the main buttress of the social fabric.

"But it must be recollected, also, that the standard of intellectual cultivation has been raised, and the objects of literary and scientific research have been multiplied, in our time, to an unprecedented extent; and that a large proportion of those new fields of literature and science bear important relations to the evidences of revealed religion. If, therefore, we would conduct the excited and highly-informed minds of the present generation to right views, and if we feel the importance of our becoming the guides of opinion, we must add, to a profound and accurate knowledge of the Sacred Volume, and of all its theological appendages, such an acquaintance with the graver literature of the age as may qualify us to combine learning and science with religion, and to prove that they illustrate and confirm Divine truth; 'ut neque religio ulla sine sapientiâ suscipienda sit; nec ulla, sine religione, probanda sapientia.'"—*Mountain's Sermons*, pp. 16, 17.

"The delight of every faithful minister of the Gospel is to preach Jesus Christ and him crucified; and he would gladly leave the defence of the establishment and temporalities of the Church in the hands of those who will generally be deemed its most disinterested advocates. It is painful to assert our own authority, and to demonstrate our own value. St. Paul complained that he was forced, by the cold indifference of his flock, to commend himself; and it is with something of the same feeling that we are reluctantly drawn into a controversy wherein our own honour and interest are so deeply concerned; but, at the present moment, we have no choice. Woe to the timid equivocator who can now hesitate to come forward in the defence of his principles; I say in the defence, for, be it observed, we have neither sought the contest, nor can we escape from it on any easier terms than the total abandonment of every point in dispute. The struggle is for the existence of an established religion, and no compromise can be effected or hoped.

"And let it be remembered, that since the contest is purely defensive on our part, it may be maintained, and, I trust, it will be maintained in a purely defensive spirit, without bitterness, without animosity, without any desire of retaliation. Let us, wherever it is possible, give our opponents credit for sincerity and good intention; and where their conduct renders this supposition vain, let us hope that they may be converted, and pray that they may be forgiven.

"Let our anxiety be for *our conduct in the struggle, not for its result.*"—*Mountain's Sermons*, pp. 45—48.

Mr. Kempthorne's work on "the Church and Convocations," opens with a remark which we would suggest to the meditation of certain fiery and mercurial spirits.

"There is a certain disease of the human mind, which, for want of

a more suitable term, may be called *locomotiveness*, or *impatience of any particular locality*."—*Kemphorne*, Preface, p. iii.

This production has some prudent and useful observations; but many suggestions which to us seem quite crude and impracticable. Thus we read, at p. 140,

"In these times, one obvious step in order to union among Protestants, that is, among sound scriptural Christians, is a holy and honourable scheme (should such a thing be possible) for bringing back the Wesleyans to some degree of connection with the National Church, if not to complete Church-fellowship, yet as confederates and supernumeraries; like the varying and irregular, but very useful light-infantry of a well-organized army; or to speak still more to the point, (for we must not be above copying a valuable lesson even from an adversary,) like the anomalous itinerating orders in the Church of Rome. Mr. Southey, first in his conclusion of his *Life of Wesley*, and afterwards in his *Colloquies*, suggests some such healing measure."—pp. 140, 141.

Our fear is, that *no* such measure would be healing. We, like Mr. Kemphorne, have perused the *Chronicles of Wesleyanism*, by Dr. Warren, and may soon make use of that work to institute a comparison between the constitution of Methodism and the constitution of the Established Church. In the mean time, according to the principle which we have always advocated, namely, that all sides should speak fairly and firmly what they mean, in order that truth may be elicited, or at least that the knowledge of real differences, which always affords some chance of their adjustment, may be substituted for the blind and dark suspicions which afford none;—according to that principle we shall now utter our sentiments as to the Wesleyans and their position. We entirely respect the individual character of many members of that connection; but we cannot admire the system which it pursues as a body; and we cannot envy the attitude in which it stands as to the Church. Are the Wesleyans for us, or against us? If they do not agree with us, they are Dissenters; if they agree with us, the rent which they make by their secession is without excuse. Our party is the party of the Church of England. With respect to those who stand apart from it we infinitely prefer the good old plan of moderation without pusillanimity, and tolerance without amalgamation. As to the Methodists, then, we neither seek their aid, nor repudiate it. It shall not be said of us, that we stretched out our arms to them with agonies of entreaty in a moment of danger, to turn our backs and reject their alliance, when safety shall have returned. And this we declare now, that, as far as we are concerned, there may be no mistake at a future moment. We stand upon our own ground, and leave others to take theirs. If our paths be the same, and they are willing to co-operate with our efforts, it is

well; but if not, we shall not be parties to any scheme of hiring auxiliaries with enormous bribes, or giving up one bulwark of the Church as the price of their assistance. We trust to the strength of our cause; and we humbly pray that God's blessing may rest upon it.

Besides, in all these matters, we must look to the nature and tendency of systems, rather than to the accidental circumstances which surround them, or the individual character of the persons who put them into action. The men perish: the system survives. The Wesleyan Methodists, for instance, profess, nor shall we question their sincerity, to be attached and even to belong to the Church of England. But this attachment, we fear, is attributable, not so much to the natural position of the Wesleyans, as to the lingering remnant of old connection, the recollections of the founder of the body still strong and endearing among its most venerable and influential members, and the gradually weakening force of long associations. But as new generations come forward; as the memories die away, and the associations are forgotten; then, the essential elements of the system, divested of the fortuitous restraints, will come into full play; and every month will rub away some particles from the iron of the link. A false and anomalous position is too irksome to admit of rest. It is hardly possible that Wesleyanism should continue in its present state. Either it must return into the bosom of the Church, or become altogether estranged. For what is adherence without conformity? What can we say to an attachment which operates like enmity? Or what can we think of an allegiance to the Church, by which her doctrines are partly invaded, and her discipline is wholly set at nought? Again, is it not evident that Methodism is actually inflicting a grievous wound upon the establishment? For the argument is, and must be, either that the Wesleyans are guilty of a wanton schism by separating and standing aloof, or that, without being dissenters upon principle, nay, while reprobating dissent upon principle and in the abstract, they find the corruptions of the Church so great and deplorable that they are debarred, by conscience and religion, from casting in their lot with her members and her ministers. But this line of conduct, surely, implies a heavier charge and condemnation against the Church and churchmen, than even the conduct of the Independents, to whom the very existence of an ecclesiastical establishment is wormwood. We would say these things mildly, charitably, kindly; but they appear to us so plain and reasonable, that we cannot disguise them: and with our persuasion that the practical workings of Wesleyanism is in every district of the kingdom to plant a meeting-house in opposition to the parish church, we are compelled to draw a distinction between our

steady friends and men who are sometimes as belligerents against us, and can never be considered as fighting in our ranks.

But we must conclude. We conclude, then, by saying, that, in spite of every danger that menaces it, and every cloud that hangs above it, and every engine that is levelled against it, we have a firm and solemn confidence in the ultimate triumph of English orthodoxy. Whether we look to the goodness of the cause, or to the learning and the piety, the number and the station, the awakened zeal and the conscientious intrepidity of the men, who are arrayed upon its side, we will not harbour an apprehension as to the coming event. It is our assured belief that the enemies who assail the Church from without, whether Dissenters or infidels, may be beaten off and put to confusion; that they, too, who have been vexing it within, either by irrational enthusiasm, or neologian rationalism, may be silenced, if not convinced;—may be taught the hopelessness, if they cannot be taught the folly and mischief, of their efforts. We are, moreover, persuaded that the present is a favourable crisis to strike vigorously and effectively for the welfare of the country, the maintenance of truth, and the honour of sound religion. It is under the force of these impressions that we would have our arms ready, and brace the sinews of our minds—for we know well that some moral courage will be requisite to bear even our part in the battle and the victory. Only we would guard against auxiliaries, who may first rush onward in a blind and headlong fury, and then turn back, like repulsed and wounded elephants, to trample down the ranks which they ought to be supporting. Only we could remonstrate against the phrenzy of taking up positions at once useless and untenable: or of defending the ground, which is most justly and righteously defensible, by weapons and modes of warfare, which bring weakness by bringing discredit. The adversaries who must be encountered inspire no terror: but there is a species of alliance which is almost enough to turn the bravest pale. If we know ourselves at all, in every syllable which we have advanced we have spoken not with a pusillanimous and treacherous wish to obtain favour, or forbearance, or compassion, or quarter from our antagonists; but with the simple desire of satisfying our own feelings, and strengthening the hands of our friends. It is precisely our wish and our resolution that the conflict should be fought fairly out, which make us gird ourselves to it with a calm and chastened, rather than an intemperate and savage spirit: it is precisely our conviction, that a decisive struggle *now* will be far more advantageous for the orthodox Church, than either an ignominious surrender, or a hollow truce, which makes us prepare to enter upon it according to the rules of honourable courtesy, and not in the uncalculating rage of a barba-

rous and malignant vindictiveness. When men who love peace, but cannot hope to enjoy it, save through the issues of strife, are compelled to assume the spear and shield, they will at least disdain the use of the scalping-knife and the tomahawk ; and, in proportion as they foresee that the sword cannot be sheathed, until either the field is their own, or their bodies are stretched upon it, so will they meekly and earnestly implore the Providence of Heaven, that, in asserting their principles, which are, and must ever be, the principles of equity and holiness, they may assert them in a manner which will leave their lustre untarnished, and will not derogate from their transcendent worth.

We have learned, we trust, to look upon these things, not as controversialists and partizans, but as men and Christians.

Mightier problems than have ever yet agitated the human mind, are now projecting their shadows at least across the disc of the earth : and, in a more especial manner, across the meridian of our country ? There is the question, what *the theology* of the Church of England is to be ? a question, which it will be quite impossible much longer to evade, and which must be brought to some adjustment, before there can be any stable repose within the precincts of the sanctuary. There is the question, we say again, whether there shall, or not, be an Ecclesiastical Establishment in the land. But this is not all. Most narrow, and shallow, and mistaken are our notions, unless we are persuaded, that the contest will go far deeper and take a far more comprehensive range. There is, or soon will be, the question, whether human affairs are to be connected with divine, or let loose and set adrift to take care of themselves : whether the concerns and the population of earth are to be submitted to any spiritual control, as being appointed of God and necessary for the guidance of his creatures ; or whether they are to acknowledge no other rule than the forms of political and intellectual jurisdiction ; whether men are to recognize certain authoritative instructions, as having emanated from Omniscience and descended from heaven ; or are to work out the solution of all moral mysteries by the unassisted force of their own minds ; and strive upwards from the regions of earth, sometimes vainly struggling through natural incapacity, sometimes beaten back by the shocks of unexpected difficulty : whether, in short, a revealed and positive religion is, or is not, to be the arbiter of life and conduct ; whether the vast chain of all things is ultimately to be fastened to the throne of the Deity, or attached to the brittle support of man's shifting opinion.

These questions, it will be easily seen, constitute the great elements of the one problem of universal well-being. They are, in fact, its very centre. And from this centre, innumerable lines are radiating to every point in the whole circumference of human

action and human thought. As these questions are decided, all else will be decided, both as to individuals, and as to collective masses of mankind. They have intimate relations with all other questions; and upon them all other questions are suspended. They involve all science and all practice; all contemplative enquiry and all active energy. In themselves, or in their application, and by the cluster of minor questions which hang around them, they run into every vein, and through every fibre, and to the remotest extremities of the social body. They bear upon the entire scheme of national government, and the minutest details of parochial administration. Nay, their determination will determine whether a nation is to be divided into parishes, under the superintendence of the clergy, or into sections, only subject to the municipal authorities, or a board of vestrymen.

Our belief is, and our trust, that religion—the Christian religion—is to be still the moving and directing power of the machine of humanity. In our eyes, therefore, the most important of all questions is, *how the church is to be improved, and through the church the world.* Here are at once introduced a number of subordinate investigations included in the main question, as not merely, for instance, what are the best forms of divinity, of clerical education and discipline, of preaching and general ministration, but what is to be the whole agency of the Church, and in what manner to be exercised; *how* is it to act by means of societies, as well as by the regular instrumentality of its clergy in their respective fields: what part is it to sustain in the diffusion of knowledge, the regulation of sentiment, the advancement of intelligence and virtue? Is its present agency, in these respects, the most judicious that could be devised? These questions, we repeat, must be patiently and carefully, boldly and honestly brought to issue; and they must be regarded with a fuller and broader survey than heretofore, as man climbs farther up the hill of his destiny, and sees a larger horizon spreading beneath his views. And men must make up their minds, and act upon their conviction. These are times which require moral firmness, even more than intellectual acuteness. Men know, for the most part, what is the just, the salutary, and the true; but they have not that strength of volition which will enable them to pursue the dictates of the understanding and the conscience. The want is not clearness of perception, but decision of purpose. The qualities, by which the country will be saved, are those plain sterling qualities of the heart, by which a man speaks out what he thinks, and does as he speaks; and without which, mere cleverness is often a mischievous possession, and wit is an empty flash, and even wisdom itself is an inoperative and useless dream.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.



THEOLOGY.

WE have a full consciousness, not unmixed with regret, that an adequate survey will not have been given, in this number of our Review, of the Theological Works which have come before us during the quarter. But it seemed better, while Parliament was sitting, and the public mind engrossed by the ferment of politico-ecclesiastical questions, to afford the greater part of our space to subjects of immediate interest and exigency, leaving for a calmer season the discussion of several valuable productions in Divinity. Among these, we may specify Mr. Creswell's elaborate "*Exposition of the Parables*"—a work now brought to its conclusion; the two volumes of Mr. Newman's Sermons; and the meritorious researches of Mr. Beke. We are also compelled to postpone an examination of the evangelical school and its labours; although several publications, in many respects able and instructive, might well demand a separate or collective notice; as, for instance, the Bishop of Winchester's Inquiry into the Ministerial Character of Christ, of which a fresh edition has been published, with additions, which almost make it a new work; Mr. Sidney's Life of Walker, of Truro; *Mr. Dale's Five Discourses before the University of Cambridge*; *Mr. Peter Hall on Congregational Reform*; with some others of less dimensions or less weight. One feature, however, which a certain party in the evangelical section of the Church is gradually assuming, we have thought it necessary to remark; we allude to that Ultra-Protestantism which declares the Reformation to be only *inchoate* and *imperfect*. Ambition appears to grow with encouragement, and either to change or enlarge its object. The aim, formerly avowed, was to *restore* the principles of Cranmer and his associates; now it is, *not* to restore, but to *complete* and *super-add*; then it was to *get back* to the old land-marks, now it is to *advance beyond* them. We respectfully submit to the persons of influence and high station in the establishment, on whose firmness and discretion we have an implicit reliance, whether it would not be well, first, to inquire, whether the objects, which we have stated, be actually entertained; and then, if they be entertained, to discountenance them in time, before the Church of England is shaken to its centre by attempts at alteration and re-construction. The design, in our humble opinion, is utterly needless, utterly presumptuous; but this is not all; it is dangerous in the extreme, because it is vast and vague, ambiguous and obscure; and still more dangerous, because it is quite unauthorised, and because the foolish pretenders, who originate it, are *altogether incompetent*, in every imaginable point of view, to manage any such undertaking. Yet the spirit of encroachment, which once urged the Puritans to declaim against the surplice, and organ, and altar-piece, is now abroad in another shape. Ultra-Protestantism of necessity

leads to Dissent. It is a step beyond Church-of-Englandism into Puritanism. Who will rejoice like the Dissenters, to hear it asserted by Clergymen of the Establishment, that the Reformation is incomplete? This is what *they* have always said. It is to adopt their sentiments and borrow their language. We speak, because we cannot allow the policy of silence. A grand and mute contempt is not the way to deal with projects which are really making their impression upon a large numerical proportion of the people—not the wisest class indeed, or the best-informed, but a class very excitable, and sometimes, in a certain sense, very religious. We repeat, that any and every assertion, if left uncontradicted, is at last believed. The argument is, these things must be true, for nobody denies them. What is meant for dignity is mistaken for defeat; and when men say nothing, the inference is, with the multitude, that they have nothing to say. There are many and most important matters, in which silence irritates, if supposed to be superciliousness; shocks, if supposed to be indifference; and ruins if supposed to be inability to plead.

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

THE overthrow of Sir Robert Peel's administration has had the present effect of interrupting many measures which were in progress for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, although it may eventually lead to enactments of a more sweeping character. The Dissenters' Marriage Bill, the Bills for the Commutation of Tithes in England, and the Adjustment of the Irish Church, are all at a stand.

Commissions, on the contrary, are in full vigour. Between the moment at which we write and the appearance of our Review, three Reports will have been laid upon the table of the House of Commons; one as to the Revenues of the Church; another as to Education in Ireland, under the two heads of *religious* and *general* instruction; and a third, from the Commissioners under the new Poor Law Act. Observations, therefore, would now be premature; however much the topics may deserve attention.

Mr. Poulter's Sabbath Observance Bill has not passed. Indeed, it seems a favourite opinion in very influential quarters, that all legislation on the subject is inexpedient. We certainly are not in favour of partial or puritanical legislation. But the existing law is often found insufficient to secure the Sabbath as an occasion of rest for persons who would wish to make it one; or to put the conscientious and religious dealer, who is reluctant to trade upon the Sunday, on the same level with the unprincipled, the greedy, and the profane, who have no scruples and are under no restraint.

Nothing, we regret to say, has yet been *done* in the important matter of *Oaths*, although we have seen frequent notices of motion. The substitution, in certain cases, of a declaration for a subscription to the Articles, having been rejected at Oxford by a majority of eight to one, is to be taken up by Lord Radnor in the House of Lords. We have no intention or inclination to disturb a verdict which has been so decisive. The contest indeed was very unequal—Rugby school and a section of Oriel college against the university of Oxford—these are "*fearful*

odds." We see, by the way, that a petition against Lord Radnor's Bill has just been carried in Convocation at Oxford by a majority of ninety-one to four.

Of Ireland and the intentions of the ministry we have already spoken. Alas! the whole scene around us, and the whole prospect before us, are frightful and painful to the dullest imagination, the coldest and stoutest heart. We look almost in vain for the elements even of hope. Well may the frame shudder, and the current of life curdle in the veins, as we read of the murder of Mr. Dawson, attended by every circumstance of ruthless atrocity, for the two-fold crime of requiring his tithes as a clergyman and his rents as a landlord. And Mr. O'Connell, while he affects to reprobate such outrages, can fan the passions that lead to them. What, is there no worse method of wringing money even from the most impoverished and goaded peasantry than the collection of legal dues. What, is the dignity of a state, the prosperity, the safety of an empire, to be flung prostrate at the feet of a mendicant demagogue? And that man can tell us, that he expects, like another Tully, to be "*hailed as the father of his country*," when an Irish Parliament shall once more meet in College Green. Hailed as the father of his country! One part at least of the parallel will be exact. He will be hailed by some bastard Brutus—some wretched and misguided ruffian—"*cruentum altè extollens pugionem*," lifting on high the dagger, or the bludgeon, or the pike, reeking with the blood of the best citizens of the land. O'Connell the father of his country! It is indeed, in a political sense, as if we should say, the father and the scourge, the father and the curse, the father and the assassin!

We have just heard it stated as a possibility that Ministers may be beaten on the Irish Church question. In that case, we can only congratulate ourselves and our readers on the *uselessness* of our preceding speculations thus happily rendered superfluous. But we dare not be sanguine.

We have also been told, that Mr. E. McDonnell has reasons of private spleen for coming forward with his conscientious scruples on the subject of the Roman Catholic Oath, and saying so loudly, "*Sum pius Æneas*." But what is this to us? We have to do with facts, not motives.

In England, we are happy to believe, that a spirit truly conservative, because not opposed to just and practicable reforms, is on the increase. The ark of our constitution is, in truth, tossed upon the foaming waves of danger; but prudence and boldness, under God's blessing, may overcome the storm. Generally and locally, in public assemblies, and parish vestries, hot disputes and controversies have arisen; but we think, upon the whole, that the Church-party has been tolerably and progressively successful.

From Scotland a deputation has arrived, and is now in London, with the illustrious Dr. Chalmers at its head; striving to mitigate an evil, which cries out for redress, quite as much among ourselves as among our Northern neighbours; endeavouring to procure the erection or enlargement of places of worship in connection with the Established Church. Some such measure is indispensable, for the stability of our institutions, and for the cause of morality and education, as well as religion, among the people—indispensable in the country, and even more indispensable in the large towns.

CHRISTIAN SOCIETIES AND PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE spring is always an active period with these societies, which have recourse, and we speak without the slightest intention of disrespect, to public exhibitions of their principles and progress. These annual meetings, if judiciously and temperately conducted, may promote many a righteous cause, which would languish without this stimulus. In the present season, however, nothing has occurred with regard to them of peculiar interest. We, therefore, leave an account of their proceedings to their own reports, or to other organs which they would probably prefer.

As to the National Society of Education, we would refer our readers to an article, which precedes these slight remarks.

Here, therefore, we would only add, that our readers will be much mistaken, if they suppose that our admiration of the principles on which that Society is founded, or our respect for the manner in which its operations are conducted, can inspire us with any undue or exclusive predilections. We may see a prevailing disposition to hail new crotchets with acclamation, and to cry down settled plans, which have worked long and well in strict accordance with the general theory and practice of our Constitution; but we only pray "*fiat justitia*:" we may smile sometimes at the whims of the hasty and half-informed education-mongers of the day; but we cannot help feeling a kind of reverence for their object, if it be really and truly the instruction of the people: we may think that extravagant expectations may be formed, and that some difficulties may occur, in the case of Normal schools, and the teachers proposed to be sent out from them; but we are, nevertheless, most cordially anxious that masters and mistresses should be well prepared and well qualified for their employment: we may resist the innovation as an absurd and perilous anamoly, that the state should connect itself with a national education upon one system, and a national Church upon another; but still we shall never be satisfied, until every child in the empire shall have the means of a good, sound, religious, and useful education, placed within its reach.

Of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge we would now simply repeat our apprehension, that its affairs will continue unsettled and uncomfortable, in the midst of its vast wealth and influence, until they are consolidated under the management of some one central and supreme committee, having all the other committees subordinated to its superintendence, and composed of the most distinguished and elevated members, who, with reference to the Society at large, will be at once the inspirers of confidence, and the depositories of responsibility and power. It is impossible, until some step like this be taken, that there should be harmony and unity pervading so large and varied a multiplicity of operations. To the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, we shall have soon occasion to advert, in grappling with the wide, and complicated, and solemnly momentous subject of missions and missionaries: but we ought, perhaps, now to congratulate it on the consecration of the Bishop of Madras.

We see, and we deprecate, the announcement of a "*Protestant Constitutional Association*," to be formed, it appears, under the auspices of the orators at Exeter Hall. As a *Society*, it is needless, it is aggressive, and, constituted as it is likely to be, if it gains any influence, it will cause ten times more disorganization, and embarrassment, and uproar, than it can possibly do good. Let us add, that we have not yet learnt to recognize Exeter Hall as the head-quarters of the Church of England, whence Protestant Societies and Established Church Societies are to issue; nor would we willingly confide the interests of the Church of England to the hands of men who vituperate the Papists with one breath, and with the next the Bishops and Clergy of their own communion. But enough; our principle is this, not to *begin* attacks, but always, where they are made upon the orthodoxy of the Establishment, to expose and repel them.

APPLICATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

THE inquiry which respects the connection of religion with general literature and science, is rapidly rising into one of the most important problems which can engage the human mind. It is also one of considerable difficulty, because it must depend for its solution upon conditions partly constant and partly variable. To what extent, and in what manner, and by what instruments the connection should be maintained; how far, and by what means, and in what proportions, human and divine knowledge should be communicated together in the education of the youthful poor, and the instruction of the adult; what interfusion there should be, and what distinction; all these are among the questions involved. There are many among us, both individuals and bodies of men, who, like the associations for diffusing useful, and entertaining, and political knowledge, would impart literature and science without religion; others, perhaps, go to the opposite extreme, and think that a supply of general knowledge indisposes and incapacitates the understanding and the soul for serious reading and religious thought. The real point is to bestow instruction, which may be general and attractive, without being altogether desultory and miscellaneous; which may sometimes lead up the mind to religion, and sometimes refresh, without weakening and distracting it. We must confess that we hardly discern the rudiments of such a system, carefully laid, or comprehensively pursued. The nearest approach, perhaps, is in the works issued by the Committee of General Literature and Education in connection with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. But they are still unquestionably defective both in the design and execution. However, we must now pause, as we have only room to say, that it is high time, if it be possible, to fix some definite principles on this interesting subject, and then apply them as a test to the publications and habits of the age.

NOTICE OF BOOKS.

OUR space is so confined that we are compelled to notice the books upon our table, not separately, but merely in the *class*; and we are sorry to say, again, that several publications have arrived too late for us to give an account of them, as also certain papers too late for us to make use of them.

First, among the elaborate and exegetical works lately published, comes, perhaps, a translation, by Dr. Wright, of the "*Biblical Hermeneutics of George Frederic Seiler, with Notes, Strictures, and Supplements, from the Dutch of J. Heringa, D.D.*" This is a production containing much that is sound and learned, and much also that is minute and trifling; and much again which is still strange to the English reader, both in the terms and the ideas. The chief fault, we think, is, that it is too desultory, too fragmentary; as well as too promiscuous and indiscriminate in its list of books and names. Another work which displays considerable erudition, and promises to gather into itself the result of many arduous researches, is the "*Biblical Theology of the Rev. Nathaniel Morren.*" But we have as yet only the first part. Among the most able of the controversial works of the quarter, we could specify Letters on "*The Philosophy of Unbelief*," by the Rev. J. Wills;" and "*A Short Method with the Romanists*," in substance, by the way, merely a republication of a Tract by the Rev. Charles Leslie, which first appeared under another name. We have also received, (published by Seeley in Fleet Street,) "*The Real Principles of the Roman Catholic Bishops and Priests in Ireland; a Letter to the Protestants of the United Kingdom*," by the Rev. B. J. M'Ghee." This Pamphlet did not reach us until our article on Ultra-Protestantism had been written and printed. It would not lead us to retract the sentiments expressed in that place, for they rest on their own grounds; but it certainly induces us to congratulate Mr. M'Ghee on the comparatively inoffensive tone which he has adopted. The view which he presents of the doctrines, and the ecclesiastical polity of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland, is, indeed, sufficiently startling; but *here* he gives us citations, not declamation. Here he gives us a legitimate statement in a legitimate mode. It is drawn up with a certain degree of cogency and skill; but, of course, we do not vouch for its accuracy. If true, it will have its weight; if incorrect, it can be met by a calm and argumentative refutation. It appeals to facts, and facts are what we want. Without, therefore, pretending to approve all its expressions, we infinitely prefer this "Letter," coming to us, as it does, through the medium of the press, to those passionate harangues at public meetings, made up and convened for the purpose, which can only lead to "hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness;" to those polemical displays which inevitably become scenes of riot and most unseemly collision, if an antagonist is allowed the power of reply; and if he is *not* allowed, are really nothing better than a delusive, and yet irritating parade.

In the matter of Libraries, it is but justice to say that the late volumes in the Series of the Sacred Classics, together with the introductory dissertations, are well-chosen and well-compiled; and in the Edinburgh Cabinet Library, "the

History and present Condition of the Barbary States," is a new contribution, materially enhancing that debt of gratitude, which the religion and literature of the empire owe to Dr. Russell of Leith, for his great and useful labours.

In the class of Biography, the "Life of Sir Matthew Hale," will, at least, be acceptable, from the subject of the Memoir, and the portions of his own composition which are interspersed; and on several grounds the Account of Lord Bolingbroke, by Mr. Cooke, is a book which deserves perusal, and to which we may return. Under this head, too, it would be a grievous wrong not to mention with passing, but cordial and almost reverential praise, the "Table Talk" of the late Mr. Coleridge; a publication, which contains the outpourings of an overflowing mind, and is singularly interesting, from the oracles which that extraordinary man took an especial pleasure in delivering on the subject of religion and ecclesiastical polity. The Editor, too, has done his part well, because he has not done too much; but has kept himself subordinate to his distinguished kinsman.

As to "Voyages and Travels," we must confess that we have been somewhat disappointed, although our disappointment may be perhaps unreasonable, in the amount of information to be derived from Mr. Barrow's "Visit to Iceland." Upon several points on which we sought instruction, the work is almost as meagre and barren as the country itself. Mr. La Martine's "Travels in Palestine" will probably be too well known to need our commendation. And Mr. Abeel's strange "Residence in China" we reserve until we have room for a detailed examination of Missionary Labours, and the best method of converting and teaching the Heathen population of our globe.

Nor are we now able, as we had fully intended, to take up the subject of American affairs; or contemplate the grateful spectacle of Episcopacy lifting its venerable head in the midst of, as they must appear to us, adverse institutions. We can only express our sincere thanks for several publications, and among them, an admirable answer to Mr. Norton. Abundant materials, of which we hope soon to avail ourselves, for a review of Religion in America, may likewise be found in Mr. Abdy's "Residence and Tour in the United States;" while some may be collected from Mrs. Butler's Journal, a work dashed off with spirit and talent, but comprising some passages as nearly indecent, and as nearly profane, as any respectable young woman has ever ventured to write.

From the mass of *Sermons* and *Miscellaneous Works* on Divinity we can only select "Sermons by Mr. Haverfield," which, although they may boast nothing peculiarly striking in the statements of theological doctrine, or very close and forcible in the reasoning, or very comprehensive in the range of ideas, are yet good among the average of discourses; while some, more especially the last, are distinguished by a rhetorical pathos and skill;—again, "Plain Sermons by Mr. Fowle," plain, it is true, but by no means destitute of useful exhortation, and a vigour which strikes home;—and likewise, "*The Course of Christian Obedience, by Mr. Kemp,*" and "*Sermons on the Hebrews,*" by the Rev. J. Spencer Knox, which are devoted to the Sacrificial and Mediatorial Character of the Saviour. Of Mr. Madge, and his two clever Discourses—for such unquestionably they are—we may have more to say in our next number.

It would be ungallant to forget "*The Immaterial System of Man*, by Elizabeth Hope," an eloquent rhapsody in two volumes; very fine, but not always very intelligible. We dare say that, if our pulpits were open to ladies, Elizabeth Hope would be a very popular preacher.

On the very important subject of Christian Charity, as connected with Poor Laws and their operation, our readers may consult with profit the Spital Sermon of Mr. James Anderson; a composition evincing great talents and great judgment;—as also a well-timed Manual, called "*The Nature and Design of the Poor Laws explained*, in an Address to the Labouring Classes, by a Norfolk Clergyman."

Under the head of Illustrative Works, we would heartily recommend Mr. Winkle's Views of our Cathedrals to the favour and regard of every Churchman, and every antiquarian, and every lover of the skilful and elegant in art. The late specimens in the "*Landscape Illustrations of the Bible*," strike us as almost more beautiful than any which have preceded them. We might say the same of Beattie's "*Delineations of Switzerland*." But we regret that it does not fall properly within our province to pass criticisms either upon these views or upon the scenic illustrations of "*Moore's Irish Melodies*."

Among *Works reprinted* we gladly mention the new edition of two of Law's celebrated Letters to Bishop Hoadley. And we have thankfully received the account of the proceedings which took place at a dinner in celebration of the repeal of the Corporation and Test Act, extracted from "*The World newspaper*." This is a seasonable reprint, which may be extremely useful as an index to the sentiments and intentions of the triumphant party at the time. Nevertheless, we could now close our observations by emphatically repeating what we have said elsewhere; namely, that we do not agree in the propriety of directing our efforts to the revocation of the two measures, known by the names of the Catholic Emancipation Bill and the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Act. Putting aside all other considerations, we think it enough to say, that in the present constitution of the House of Commons, and the present temper of the country, the attempt would prove a signal and calamitous failure; and would even assist and encourage the friends of anarchy and radicalism, by splitting and weakening the conservative party. We *must* conform ourselves to circumstances, and look around and forward, rather than behind. It is a fond and idle folly to miss the objects which may yet be attained in the fruitless and disheartening pursuit of such as are impracticable. Why waste our energies, only to excite the derision of our opponents? It is the part of a wise man to *preserve* that which is still his, and is still valuable to him; it is the part of a child to cry and struggle for that which is gone, and which he cannot *recover*. These remarks may, it is quite possible, jar unpleasantly upon the feelings of some persons whom we are anxious to please; but when we are, perhaps, on the very eve of an awful and envenomed conflict, involving in its issue our political and our religious constitution, it were a treacherous cowardice not to deliver our minds with honest freedom;—*for one false step may be fatal*.

WALKER'S
CRITICAL PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY
ENTIRELY REMODELLED.

JUNE 1ST, 1835.

This Day is published, in Octavo, price One Shilling and Sixpence,

PART I.,

A

NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY,

ADAPTED TO

THE PRESENT STATE OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE,

AND

FITTED, BY ITS COMPACT SIZE, FOR GENERAL USE.

BY B. H. SMART,

AUTHOR OF AN OUTLINE OF SEMATOLOGY; A PRACTICAL GRAMMAR OF
ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION;
THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ELOCUTION, ETC.

THE undertaking for the Original Proprietors of WALKER'S DICTIONARY was simply to improve the last Edition of their Work; but, in fulfilling this task, MR. SMART has really produced a new Work, of which the chief features are:—

1. A more accurate analysis of the sounds of the language, with correspondent Schemes and Principles of Pronunciation.

2. A method of indicating the pronunciation of words, which, by renouncing altogether the pretence of exhibiting no more letters than sounds, is less barbarous to the eye, and at once intelligible.

These are the altered features of the work as a “Critical *Pro-*

nouncing Dictionary":—other improvements of a higher kind are attempted:—viz.,

1. To exhibit words in such a manner as to make those of the same family throw a light on each other's meaning and application.

2. To furnish as much insight into the etymology and composition of words as can be given to a mere *English* inspector.

3. To mark, in instances that require it, the change from ancient to modern usage, and to distinguish words that are obsolete or obsolescent, technical, unusual, partially authorized, or vulgar.

4. To restore from Johnson's Dictionary the obsolete words which WALKER omits, because they are necessary to the reading of authors of the Elizabethan age; and to insert, from TODD, WEBSTER, and other sources, ALL the important words which the progress of literature and science has accumulated since the days of JOHNSON.

5. To define, with cautious exactitude, words applied to the assumed *data* in all general or abstract reasoning, and which refer, in any way, to the process itself: because, in a Dictionary meant for general use, it is deemed highly important to indicate the fact, that words are not merely the expositors, but are also the INSTRUMENTS of thinking.

In addition to the necessary Schemes and Principles, the Work will be accompanied by—

1. Hints for surmounting Defects of Speech, Foreign, Provincial, Vulgar, and Impedimental.

2. An Etymological Index of Common Terminations.

3. Walker's Key to the Classical Pronunciation of Greek, Latin, and Scripture Proper Names.

The Volume, including a great many thousand words which are not to be found in the present edition of Walker's Dictionary,—all, in short, of any claim to notice which subsequent dictionaries exhibit,—will comprise about fifty sheets, or eight hundred pages octavo:—it will be published in ten Monthly Parts of five sheets each, price One Shilling and Sixpence.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, STRAND;

AND THE OTHER PROPRIETORS.

1835.

WALKER'S
CRITICAL PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY
ENTIRELY REMODELLED.

JUNE 1ST, 1835.

This Day is published, in Octavo, price One Shilling and Sixpence,

PART I.,

A

NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY,

ADAPTED TO

THE PRESENT STATE OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE,

AND

FITTED, BY ITS COMPACT SIZE, FOR GENERAL USE.

BY B. H. SMART,

AUTHOR OF AN OUTLINE OF SEMATOLOGY; A PRACTICAL GRAMMAR OF
ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION;
THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ELOCUTION, ETC.

THE undertaking for the Original Proprietors of WALKER'S DICTIONARY was simply to improve the last Edition of their Work; but, in fulfilling this task, MR. SMART has really produced a new Work, of which the chief features are:—

1. A more accurate analysis of the sounds of the language, with correspondent Schemes and Principles of Pronunciation.
2. A method of indicating the pronunciation of words, which, by renouncing altogether the pretence of exhibiting no more letters than sounds, is less barbarous to the eye, and at once intelligible.

These are the altered features of the work as a “Critical *Pro-*

nouncing Dictionary":—other improvements of a higher kind are attempted:—viz.,

1. To exhibit words in such a manner as to make those of the same family throw a light on each other's meaning and application.

2. To furnish as much insight into the etymology and composition of words as can be given to a mere *English* inspector.

3. To mark, in instances that require it, the change from ancient to modern usage, and to distinguish words that are obsolete or obsolescent, technical, unusual, partially authorized, or vulgar.

4. To restore from Johnson's Dictionary the obsolete words which WALKER omits, because they are necessary to the reading of authors of the Elizabethan age; and to insert, from TODD, WEBSTER, and other sources, ALL the important words which the progress of literature and science has accumulated since the days of JOHNSON.

5. To define, with cautious exactitude, words applied to the assumed *data* in all general or abstract reasoning, and which refer, in any way, to the process itself: because, in a Dictionary meant for general use, it is deemed highly important to indicate the fact, that words are not merely the expositors, but are also the INSTRUMENTS of thinking.

In addition to the necessary Schemes and Principles, the Work will be accompanied by—

1. Hints for surmounting Defects of Speech, Foreign, Provincial, Vulgar, and Impedimental.

2. An Etymological Index of Common Terminations.

3. Walker's Key to the Classical Pronunciation of Greek, Latin, and Scripture Proper Names.

The Volume, including a great many thousand words which are not to be found in the present edition of Walker's Dictionary,—all, in short, of any claim to notice which subsequent dictionaries exhibit,—will comprise about fifty sheets, or eight hundred pages octavo:—it will be published in ten Monthly Parts of five sheets each, price One Shilling and Sixpence.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, STRAND;
AND THE OTHER PROPRIETORS.

CHURCH REVENUE COMMISSION.

Preparing for Publication,

AND WILL, IF POSSIBLE, BE ISSUED THE SECOND WEEK IN JULY,

In 1 vol. Demy 8vo. 16s. boards,

LIBER ECCLESIASTICUS: being an Account of the REVENUES of the several ARCHIEPISCOPAL and EPISCOPAL SEES, CATHEDRALS, COLLEGIATE CHURCHES, and ECCLESIASTICAL CORPORATIONS; the SEPARATE REVENUES of the several PREBENDS and OTHER PREFERMENTS in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches; the present NET VALUE and Nature of each BENEFICE (distinguishing such as have Glebe Houses), with the Name of the PATRON, the Dedication of the Church, the Population of each Parish and Chapelry. To which are added several useful Tables of Averages, &c. &c. Extracted, with Corrections and Additions, from the voluminous "REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED TO INQUIRE RESPECTING ECCLESIASTICAL REVENUES IN ENGLAND AND WALES," presented to Parliament by Command of HIS MAJESTY.

In bringing before the Public this most important and authentic record of the Revenues of the Established Church in England and Wales, the chief object has been, by publishing in a condensed and comparatively cheap form, so as to be within the reach of the Parochial Clergy and the Public generally, to promote the more extensive circulation of the large mass of interesting information contained in the bulky and almost unattainable Report of the Commissioners.

The arrangement of the present Work differs in some respects from that adopted in the Report. In the latter, the Benefices are classed under the several *Sees*; a mode which, however desirable in official returns, is confounding to the common inquirer, by demanding of him a knowledge of the particular Diocese in which a Benefice is placed, before he can avail himself of the information contained in the Report. In this Work, on the contrary, all the Livings are arranged in strictly *alphabetic* order, the names of the County and Diocese being appended to each; so that any Parish or Chapelry can be referred to with the greatest facility. This arrangement, too, will render the work valuable even to Members of Parliament, or other persons possessing a copy of the official document, by making it serve as an *Index* to the Folio Volumes of the Commissioners. The orthography of the Parishes, &c. is corrected throughout, and much useful matter added: particularly Tables of the Benefices in the gift of the Crown, the Universities, and the several Colleges: shewing at one view the extent of Patronage possessed by each.

The Work will be published by Messrs. HAMILTON, ADAMS, and Co., Paternoster Row.



EDINBURGH CABINET LIBRARY.

AFRICA COMPLETED,

**In Four Volumes, price only Twenty Shillings, of which any one
may be had separately.**

THE PROPRIETORS of the EDINBURGH CABINET LIBRARY have much satisfaction in announcing to the Public the completion of that part of their Plan, which comprehends the History, the Antiquities, the Geography, the Statistics, and Natural Productions of the African Continent.

Four volumes have now appeared, illustrative of those interesting subjects, and devoted to particular sections of that quarter of the globe. The first of these, entitled NARRATIVE OF DISCOVERY AND ADVENTURE IN AFRICA, not only describes the natural features of that continent, and the social condition of its people, but also exhibits a view of whatever is most interesting in the researches and observations of those travellers who have sought to explore its interior, from the times of the Greeks and Romans down to the recent expeditions of Park, Clapperton, and Lander; thus presenting within a narrow compass all that is known of those immense deserts which have hitherto been a blank in the geography of the world.

The second volume, VIEW OF ANCIENT AND MODERN EGYPT, has for its object to lay before the reader every thing which has been ascertained respecting that wonderful country, from the days of the Pharaohs down to our own; marking the progress of the human race in civilisation and learning, and more especially the beginnings of society, at the earliest period to which the writings of uninspired authors carry back the mind of the contemplative student. This narrative displays the genius and astonishing acquirements of the old Egyptians, chiefly through the medium of those great works of architecture, statuary, and sculpture, which are still to be found on the banks of the Nile. Pains have also been taken to explain the labours of Young, Champollion, and other learned men at home and abroad, who, since the beginning of the present century, have contributed not a little to throw light on the remote ages which preceded the Persian Conquest, hitherto consigned to mysticism and fable. Equal care has been taken with the history of Modern Egypt, the main facts being derived from the communications of such writers as had dwelt some time in the country, and who thereby enjoyed an opportunity, not only of recording the principal events which have taken place under the government of Mohammed Ali, but also of comparing the actual condition of the inhabitants with the barbarism from which they have gradually emerged.

NUBIA AND ABYSSINIA constitute the subject of the third volume, regions than which none could possibly be more interesting to the antiquary and the scholar.

They were universally regarded by the poets and philosophers of Greece, as the cradle of those arts which at a later period covered the kingdom of the Pharaohs with so many splendid monuments, and also of those religious rites which, after being slightly modified by the priests of Thebes, were adopted by the ancestors of Homer and Virgil as the basis of their mythology. In tracing the connexion of the primitive people who dwell on the Upper Nile with the inhabitants of Arabia and the remoter East, the author has availed himself of the best information that could be procured from Continental authors, as well as from the volumes of our own countrymen who have ascended above the Second Cataract. The late expedition of Ishmael Pasha into Sennaar, and the other districts watered by the Blue and White Rivers, has added greatly to our topographical knowledge of that portion of Africa, one of the least frequented by Europeans. Among the interesting facts fully established by recent travellers into Ethiopia, none is more worthy of notice than the circumstance that the Christian religion, received about fifteen hundred years ago, continues to be professed by a great majority of the people. Of the literature of the same ancient nation, so far as the relics of it can be collected from their chronicles and books of devotion, a suitable account has been given. But the reader will be mainly surprised at the extent and magnificence of the architectural remains of Nubia, which in some instances have been found to rival, and in others even to surpass, the more celebrated buildings of Egypt. It will no longer be denied by any one, that the pattern or type of those stupendous erections which continue to excite the admiration of the tourist, at Karnac, Luxor, and Ghizeh, may be detected in the numerous monuments still visible between the site of the famed Meroë and the Falls of Es Souan.

The fourth volume, entitled the **HISTORY AND PRESENT CONDITION OF THE BARBARY STATES**, presents an historical elucidation of those remarkable provinces which stretch along the southern shores of the Mediterranean, from the period when they were first colonized by the Phœnicians to the most recent times. In this retrospect are exhibited the rise of the Carthaginians,—their progress in commerce, navigation, and agriculture,—their struggle with the Romans for universal dominion,—and also their misfortunes, defeats, and final subjugation. A view is likewise given of the establishment of the Christian religion in Northern Africa,—the character of the more distinguished divines, their doctrines and usages, till the light of the primitive faith was obscured by the ascendancy of the Vandals. The annals of Modern Barbary make the reader acquainted with the relations which so long subsisted between her rulers and the maritime states of Europe, and also with the origin of the several wars which from time to time were waged against the pirates of Sallee, Tunis, and Algiers, by the Germans, French, and English. The trade, manufactures, and agricultural resources of the whole coast, from Cyrenaica to Morocco, are illustrated by a reference to the latest authorities, more especially those writers who have visited the several Regencies since the bombardment conducted by Lord Exmouth, and the invasion of General Bourmont.

Such is a general outline of the volumes devoted to the illustration of Africa,—a portion of the globe the interest of which is every day increasing in the eyes of Europeans. To point out the peculiar advantages of this part of their scheme appears to the Publishers altogether superfluous; for, after the delineation just given, no additional evidence can be necessary to satisfy the intelligent reader,

that he is hereby provided with a complete and connected view of African history, geography, literature, and natural science.

It may not be unseasonable to remark, that each volume is sold for five shillings, although the quantity of letterpress greatly exceeds what is found in any similar publication. The Maps, too, prefixed to the several works, are accurately constructed, and have been from time to time carefully compared with the descriptions of the latest travellers. Numerous Engravings also, including some fine Portraits, have been introduced, with the view of illustrating the text, and conveying suitable ideas of the several countries to whose scenery they bear a reference.

The completion of this part of their undertaking will, the Proprietors hope, be regarded as an earnest of their intentions with respect to all the other sections of the EDINBURGH CABINET LIBRARY.

THE FOLLOWING

VALUABLE WORKS

HAVE APPEARED IN

THE EDINBURGH CABINET LIBRARY,

Beautifully printed in small 8vo; with Maps constructed for the Work, Portraits, and numerous other appropriate Engravings: Price of each Volume in Cloth Boards 5s.

I.

NARRATIVE of DISCOVERY and ADVENTURE in the POLAR SEAS and REGIONS: With Illustrations of their Climate, Geology, and Natural History; and an Account of the WHALE-FISHERY. By Sir JOHN LESLIE, PROFESSOR JAMESON, and HUGH MURRAY, Esq., F.R.S.E.—4th Edition.—In one volume.

II.

NARRATIVE of DISCOVERY and ADVENTURE in AFRICA, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time: With Illustrations of the Geology, Mineralogy, and Zoology. By HUGH MURRAY, Esq., F.R.S.E.; PROFESSOR JAMESON; and JAMES WILSON, Esq., F.R.S.E. & M.W.S.—2d Edition.—In one volume.

III.

VIEW of ANCIENT and MODERN EGYPT: With an Outline of its Natural History. By the Rev. MICHAEL RUSSELL, LL.D.—2d Edition.—In one volume.

IV.

PALESTINE, or the HOLY LAND; from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By the Rev. MICHAEL RUSSELL, LL.D.—3d Edition.—In one volume.

V.

LIVES and VOYAGES of DRAKE, CAVENDISH, and DAMPIER: Including an Introductory View of the Earlier Discoveries in the South Sea; and the HISTORY of the BUCCANEERS.—2d Edition.—In one volume.

VI. VII. VIII.

HISTORICAL and DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNT of BRITISH INDIA, from the most Remote Period to the Present Time: Including a Narrative of the Early Portuguese and English Voyages, the Revolutions in the Mogul Empire, and the Origin, Progress, and Establishment of the British Power: With Illustrations of the Zoology—Botany—Climate, Geology, and Mineralogy;—Also Medical Observations,—an Account of the Hindoo Astronomy—the Trigonometrical Surveys—and the Navigation of the Indian Seas. By HUGH MURRAY, Esq., F.R.S.E.; JAMES WILSON, Esq., F.R.S.E. & M.W.S.; R. K. GHEVILLE, LL.D.; PROFESSOR JAMESON; WHITELAW AINSLIE, M.D., M.R.A.S., late of the Medical Staff of Southern India; WILLIAM RHIND, Esq., M.R.C.S.; PROFESSOR WALLACE; and Captain CLARENCE DALRYMPLE, Master Attendant at Madras.—2d Edition.—In three volumes.

IX.

HISTORICAL VIEW of the **PROGRESS OF DISCOVERY** on the more **NORTHERN COASTS OF AMERICA**, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By **P. FRASER TYTLER**, Esq., F.R.S. & F.S.A. With **DESCRIPTIVE SKETCHES** of the **NATURAL HISTORY** of the **NORTH AMERICAN REGIONS**. By **JAMES WILSON**, Esq., F.R.S.E. & M.W.S. To which is added, an **APPENDIX**, containing Remarks on a late Memoir of Sebastian Cabot, with a Vindication of Richard Hakluyt.—In one volume.

X.

THE TRAVELS & RESEARCHES of **ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT**: Being a condensed Narrative of his Journeys in the Equinoctial Regions of America, and in Asiatic Russia; together with Analyses of his more important Investigations. By **WILLIAM MACGILLIVRAY**, A.M., F.R.S.E., Conservator of the Museums of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, Member of the Natural History Societies of Edinburgh and Philadelphia, &c.—2d Edition.—In one volume.

XI.

LIFE of **SIR WALTER RALEIGH**: Founded on Authentic and Original Documents, some of them never before published: Including a View of the most important Transactions in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.; Sketches of Burleigh, Essex, Secretary Cecil, Sidney, Spenser, and other Eminent Contemporaries: With a Vindication of his Character from the Attacks of Hume and other Writers. By **PATRICK FRASER TYTLER**, Esq., F.R.S. & F.S.A.—2d Edition.—In one volume.

XII.

NUBIA and **ABYSSINIA**: Comprehending their Civil History, Antiquities, Arts, Religion, Literature, and Natural History. By the Rev. **MICHAEL RUSSELL**, LL.D., Author of "View of Ancient and Modern Egypt," "Palestine, or the Holy Land," &c.—In one volume.

XIII. XIV.

HISTORY of **ARABIA**, Ancient and Modern: Containing a Description of the Country—an Account of its Inhabitants, Antiquities, Political Condition, and Early Commerce—the Life and Religion of Mohammed—the Conquests, Arts, and Literature of the Saracens—the Caliphs of Damascus, Bagdad, Africa, and Spain—the Civil Government and Religious Ceremonies of the Modern Arabs—Origin and Suppression of the Wahabees—the Institutions, Character, Manners, and Customs of the Bedouins; and a comprehensive View of its Natural History. By **ANDREW CRICHTON**.—2d Edition.—In two volumes.

XV.

AN HISTORICAL and **DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNT** of **PERSIA**, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time: With a detailed View of its Resources, Government, Population, Natural History, and the Character of its Inhabitants, particularly of the Wandering Tribes; including a Description of Afghanistan and Beloochistan. By **JAMES B. FRASER**, Esq., Author of "Travels in Khorasan," "A Tour through the Himala," &c. &c.—In one volume.

XVI.

LIVES of **EMINENT ZOOLOGISTS**, from **ARISTOTLE** to **LINNÆUS** inclusive: With Introductory Remarks on the Study of Natural History, and Occasional Observations on the Progress of Zoology. By **W. MACGILLIVRAY**, A.M., F.R.S.E., &c., Author of "A Narrative of the Travels and Researches of Alexander Von Humboldt."—In one volume.

XVII.

HISTORY and **PRESENT CONDITION** of the **BARBARY STATES**: Comprehending a View of their Civil Institutions, Antiquities, Arts, Religion, Literature, Commerce, Agriculture, and Natural Productions. By the Rev. **MICHAEL RUSSELL**, LL.D., Author of "View of Ancient and Modern Egypt," "Palestine, or the Holy Land," "Nubia and Abyssinia," &c.—In one volume.

*. * The Publishers have issued a Plan of the Edinburgh Cabinet Library—containing a brief Analysis of the Works already published, with Notices of those in preparation—which may be had of all Booksellers.

PRINTED FOR OLIVER & BOYD, EDINBURGH;
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO., LONDON;
DAVID ROBERTSON, GLASGOW;
AND WILLIAM CURRY, JUN. & CO., DUBLIN.

July, 1835.

NEW WORKS,
PUBLISHED BY
JACKSON AND WALFORD,
18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
London.

In Two Vols. 8vo, with LITHOGRAPHIC VIEWS and WOOD CUTS, 24s. Cloth.

A NARRATIVE
OF THE
VISIT TO THE AMERICAN CHURCHES,

BY THE
DEPUTATION FROM THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION
OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

By ANDREW REED, D.D. AND JAMES MATHESON, D.D.

"To those who read for information or amusement, these volumes may be safely recommended; those who wish to acquire a knowledge of the present state of religion in America will of course procure them."—*Spectator*.

"—— leaves all former descriptions of that interesting country at an immeasurable distance."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

"Every reader of these volumes must rise from the perusal with an entire confidence in the honesty and fairness, as well as the competency, of the witnesses."—*Eclectic Review*.

"—— for the imaginative, the moral, or the theological student, there are here ample funds."—*Monthly Review*.

In Post Octavo, with a FULL LENGTH PORTRAIT from an Original Painting in Possession of the Family. 10s. 6d. Cloth.

MEMOIRS
OF THE LIFE, CHARACTER, & WRITINGS
OF
SIR MATTHEW HALE, KNIGHT,
LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND.

By J. B. WILLIAMS, Esq. LL.D. F.S.A.

"Dr. Williams has, we think, conferred an essential benefit on the profession, and especially on its younger members, by the production of this volume."—*Legal Observer*.

"We cordially recommend this memoir of a great and good man, a sincere Christian, and a paragon judge, as a book eminently fitted to make the reader wiser, better, and happier."—*Tait's Magazine*.

"Certainly the amplest and perhaps the best Life of Hale extant."—*Spectator*.

"Dr. Williams has diligently consulted every available source of information, and added much to our knowledge of Hale in private life."—*Athenaeum*.

"His whole life is one most deserving of study, and connected as it was with the history of his times, not the lawyer alone, but the general reader, will find much to interest and inform him in this volume."—*Literary Gazette*.

Works published by Jackson and Walford.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS ; or, Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation. By RALPH WARDLAW, D. D. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d. cloth.

"Dr. W. has conducted his argument with profound theological wisdom, and admirable philosophical acuteness."—*Christian Guardian*.

"He has shown considerable talent and power of writing."—*British Critic*.

The CAUSES of the CORRUPTION of CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. ROBERT VAUGHAN, Professor of Ancient and Modern History in the University of London, Author of the *Life of Wycliffe*, &c. &c. 8vo. 10s. 6d. cloth.

"Mr. Vaughan has brought to his undertaking the knowledge of the historian, the learning of the divine, and the spirit of the philosopher."—*Spectator*.

"The examination of the effects produced on Christianity by the influence of Gentile Philosophy, is equally remarkable for learning and discrimination."—*Athenæum*.

"Mr. Vaughan is a pleasing writer."—*British Magazine*.

LECTURES on the ATHEISTIC CONTROVERSY; delivered at Bradford, Yorkshire. By the Rev. B. GODWIN, Author of "*Lectures on British Colonial Slavery*." 8vo. 6s. cloth.

"——— deserves to rank with Butler, Clarke, and Paley. If any controversial work could win converts, this is one of the best calculated to effect that object."—*Athenæum*.

"Mr. Godwin is no ordinary writer."—*Baptist Magazine*.

**A DISCOURSE of NATURAL and MORAL IMPO-
TENCY.** By JOSEPH TRUMAN, B. D. A New Edition, with a Biographical Introduction by HENRY ROGERS. Royal 16mo. 3s. cloth.

"This is a neat and well executed edition of a valuable work."—*Congreg. Mag.*

"We recommend this acute little piece to all our theological students and young pastors, who will perceive that they are also greatly indebted to Mr. Rogers for his admirable introduction."—*Baptist Magazine*.

LETTERS to a FRIEND; intended to relieve the Difficulties of an anxious Inquirer, under serious Impressions, on the Subjects of Conversion and Salvation. By the late Rev. THOMAS CHARLTON HENRY, D. D. of Charleston, South Carolina. Revised and corrected, with Memoirs of the Author, and other Prefatory Matter, by JOHN PAL SMITH, D. D. and the Rev. THOS. LEWIS. A New Edition. 18mo. 1s. cloth

"It will be found a treasure to the anxious inquirer; and we hope many of our more advanced readers, who watch over the first impressions of their younger friends, will avail themselves of the powerful aid of this admirable treatise."—*Evangelical Register*

"This is a reprint of a work containing some of the clearest views of experimental religion that ever fell from the pen of one not endowed with inspiration."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

The **TRUTH** of **REVELATION** demonstrated by an Appeal to existing Monuments, Sculptures, Gems, Coins, and Medals. By a **FELLOW** of several **LEARNED SOCIETIES**. Illustrated by numerous Plates and Wood Cuts. 12mo. 10s. cloth.

"This is a very curious, indeed an important work, and should be widely circulated."—*Spectator*.

"Every page affords the amplest evidence of rational piety and profound learning."—*Atlas*.

The **BOW** in the **CLOUD**; or, the **NEGRO'S MEMORIAL**. A Collection of Original Contributions, in Prose and Verse, by some of the most distinguished Writers of the Day, illustrative of the Evils of Slavery, and commemorative of its Abolition in the British Colonies. With an elegant engraved Title-Page. Foolscap 8vo. Turkey morocco, 12s.

"A galaxy of names of varying magnitude, but all blending their rays in one stream of light."—*Eclectic Review*.

"The many friends of the slave, who would desire a memorial of the negro, could not have one more worthy than the 'Bow in the Cloud.'"—*Leeds Mercury*.

On **PROTESTANT NONCONFORMITY**. By **JOSIAH CONDER**. Two Vols. 8vo. 14s.; or, Abridged, in 12mo. Second Edition. 5s. 6d. boards.

"I also strongly, and above all, recommend the cool, the philosophica., the scriptural, the masterly work of 'Conder on Nonconformity.'"—*James's Dissent and the Church of England*.

SKETCHES of **SERMONS**, furnished by their respective Authors; with an Index of the Texts, &c. Eight Vols. 12mo. 1l. 12s. boards; or separate, 4s. each.

- These volumes contain 400 Sermons, on some of the most interesting passages of Holy Writ, preached to congregations of the United Kingdom and on the European Continent.
-

The **CONTRIBUTIONS** of **Q. Q.** By the late **JANE TAYLOR**. Seventh Edition. Two Vols. 12mo. 9s. boards.

MEMOIRS, CORRESPONDENCE, and POETICAL REMAINS of the late **JANE TAYLOR**. A new Edition. In One Vol. 12mo. 5s. boards.

MEMOIRS of the **LIFE** and **CHARACTER** of **MRS. S. SAVAGE**. By **J. B. WILLIAMS**, Esq. LL.D. F.S.A. With a Preface by the Rev. **WILLIAM JAY**. To which are added, **MEMOIRS** of **HER SISTER, MRS. HULTON**. Fourth Edition, corrected and enlarged. 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

The **PASTOR'S SKETCH BOOK**; or, Authentic Narratives from Real Life. By **GEORGE REDFORD, A.M.** Third Edition, with Additional Narratives. 12mo. 5s. boards.

LECTURES on the **CHRISTIAN SABBATH**. By **WILLIAM THORN**. Seventh Edition, enlarged. 18mo. 3s. 6d. boards.

Works published by Jackson and Walford.

THE PROTESTANT DISSENT VINDICATED from the Charge of being Unscriptural and Unjustifiable. A LETTER to the Rev. SAMUEL LEE, D.D. &c. &c. in Reply to that Gentleman's Letter to the Author, entitled, "Dissent Unscriptural and Unjustifiable." By J. PYE SMITH, D.D. & LL.D. Second Edition. 8vo. 2s.

By the Same Author,

THE PROTESTANT DISSENT FURTHER VINDICATED on the grounds of Holy Scripture, the Moral Obligations of Men, and the Liberties of Britons: in a REJOINDER to the Rev. SAMUEL LEE, D.D. &c. &c. upon that Gentleman's Second Letter to the Author, repeating his former Charges. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

ON THE TEMPER to be Cultivated by Christians of different Denominations towards each other: A SERMON, preached before the Monthly Association of Congregational Churches and Pastors, October 9th, 1834. Second Edition. 8vo. 1s.

THE NECESSITY OF RELIGION to the Well-being of a Nation: a SERMON, preached before the Monthly Association of Congregational Churches and Pastors, February 6th, 1834. With an Appendix on the Subjects at present agitated between Churchmen and Dissenters. Second Edition. 8vo. 1s.

IRELAND'S MISERY and REMEDY: or, Ireland a Field of Missionary Labour: a DISCOURSE delivered at the Monthly Meeting of the London Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches, April 9th, 1835. By JOHN HOPPUS, M.A. 8vo. 2s.

By the same Author,

THE DIFFICULTIES of INFIDELITY; or, the Obstacles, Intellectual and Moral, to an Infidel State of Mind. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE IMPORTANCE of REVELATION; or, the Holy Scriptures the only adequate Source of Knowledge respecting the Character and Moral Government of God. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE ULTIMATE OBJECT of the EVANGELICAL DISSENTERS avowed and advocated. A SERMON. By T. BINNEY. 8vo. 1s.

MR. BINNEY'S ADDRESS, with brief Prefatory Remarks on the Nature of certain Animadversions on the Publication and its Author. 8vo. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 1s.

WORKS ADAPTED FOR THE YOUNG.

ELEMENTS of USEFUL KNOWLEDGE in Geography, Astronomy, and other Sciences. By J. ALLRUT. A new and Improved Edition. 3s. 6d. bound.

MEMOIR of J. HOWARD HINTON, who died at Reading, Jan. 10, 1835, aged Thirteen Years and Seven Months. By His FATHER. 32mo. 1s. cloth.

THE TRUTH and EXCELLENCE of the CHRISTIAN REVELATION demonstrated, in Two Addresses, intended principally for the Young and the Unlearned. By W. YOUNGMAN. 12mo. 3s. cloth.

THE EARLY LIFE of CHRIST, an Example to the Young. By the Rev. HENRY MARCH, Author of "Sabbaths at Home." 12mo. 4s. bds.

COTTAGE STORIES; or, Poems on Domestic Occurrences, designed for those in Humble Life. By the Author of "The Female Missionary Advocate." 18mo. 1s. sewed.

THE BIRTH-DAY PRESENT. By MRS. SHERWOOD, Author of "Little Henry and his Bear," &c. 18mo. Half bound. 1s.

HYMNS for INFANT MINDS. By MRS. GILBERT and JANE TAYLOR. Twenty-seventh Edition. 18mo. 1s. 6d. half-bound.

By the same Authors.

ORIGINAL HYMNS for SUNDAY SCHOOLS. A new Stereotype Edition. 2d. sewed.

HYMNS for INFANT SCHOOLS. By MRS. GILBERT. 12mo. 4d. sewed.

••• Twelve Hymns, selected from the above, may be had for the Use of Infant Schools. Printed on broad sheets, for pasting on boards. 2s. per set.

By the same Author,

ORIGINAL ANNIVERSARY HYMNS, adapted to the Public Services of Sunday Schools and Sunday School Unions. 18mo. 6d. sewed.

A COMPANION to the ATLAS; or, a Series of Geographical Tables, on a new plan; forming a Complete System of Geography. By ERNEST MILLER, A.M. Small folio. 9s. cloth.

Supplement

To:

HENRY COXHEAD'S

LIST OF MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS

PUBLISHED IN MAY LAST.

NOV 19 1961

No. 4, NEWMAN'S ROW, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS,

(NEAR GREAT TURNSTILE.)

At the very low **READY MONEY** prices offered thereto.

- | | | | |
|------|--|-----|--|
| 830 | ADOLPHUS' Biographical Memoirs of the French Revolution, 2 vols. 8vo. <i>coll.</i> , 1s 6d 1799 | 815 | ANNUAL BIOGRAPHY and Obituary, 6 1830 and 1831, 8vo. <i>bds.</i> <i>uncut</i> , 5s each |
| 831 | ADVENTURER, 4 vols. 12mo. <i>coll.</i> , 5s 1797 | 816 | ANGLER, the Universal, made so by Three Books of Fishing; the First by Mr. Isaac Walton; the second by Charles Cotton, Esq. and the third by Col. Robert Venables, 12mo. <i>p. plates</i> , good copy, scarce, 10s 6d 167 |
| 832 | ÆSOP'S Fables Paraphrased, in Verse, by J. Ogilby, with 31 cuts by Hellar, small 16s. 9s 1694 | 817 | ANTIQUARIAN Cabinet and Itinerary, with the Ancient Relics, in all 19 vols. 12mo. <i>bds.</i> <i>hand impressions of the numerous plates, h/.</i> <i>uncut</i> , gut. <i>tops</i> , 6 guineas (pub. at £14. 5s.) 181 |
| 833 | AIKIN'S Dictionary of Chemistry and Mineralogy, 2 vols. 8to. <i>plates, h/.</i> <i>essen.</i> <i>copy scarce</i> , £2. 10s 1807 | 818 | ARISTO, Orlando Furioso, with Memoirs and Notes by Antonio Panizzi, 4 vols. cr. 8vo. <i>new</i> , £1. 10s (pub. at £2. 10s) <i>Pickering</i> , 183 |
| 834 | AIKIN'S (Miss) Memoirs of the Court of Elizabeth, 2 vols. 8vo. <i>h/.</i> <i>russia</i> , 16s 1813 | 819 | ARISTO, Orlando Furioso, Buttura, 8 vols. 8mo. <i>coll.</i> , <i>gilt leaves</i> , £1. 5s 182 |
| 835 | AIKIN'S (Dr.) Select Works of the British Poets, from Ben Jonson to Keats, thick 8vo. 4 <i>l/.</i> , 13s (<i>see Southern Poets</i>) | 820 | ARCYANA, or Museum of Natural History, small 8vo. containing 34 coloured plates, <i>h/.</i> <i>new</i> , 11s 181 |
| 835* | AINSWORTH'S English and Latin Dictionary, by Morell, 4to. 10s 6d 1765 | 821 | ARMSTRONG'S Gaelic Dictionary, 8to. <i>b/.</i> 15s |
| 836 | AKERMAN'S Catalogue of Roman Coins, 2 vols. royal 8vo. <i>large Paper</i> , <i>uncut</i> , <i>coll.</i> , £2. 15s | 822 | ATLANTIC Club Book, 2 vols. 12mo. <i>cl/.</i> 7s 183 |
| 837 | ALDRICH'S Elements of Civil Architecture, 8vo. <i>cop.</i> <i>new</i> , 180d 1812 | 823 | ATLAS of the English Counties, projected by the English County Survey, by order of the Board of Ordnance, fol. <i>coll. new</i> , £1. 10s 183 |
| 838 | AMERICA, The History and Topography of the United States of America, 2 vols. <i>pic. engraved</i> , <i>new</i> , 100 pages, <i>pic. 100 pages</i> , <i>new</i> , <i>coll.</i> , <i>coll.</i> , £2. 15s | 824 | ATLANTIC GEOGRAPHY, or Colley Coffer, Hume Fully, Voltaire, Marabout, Mac, du Larr W. Samson, Korzeu, Cruchon, Edouard Gellard, Lewis, Holberg, Dury, Whitehead Ferguson, Mrs. Robinson, Mrs. Clarke, Lord Herbert of Chesham, Prince Eugene, James Hardy Vaux, Gellion, Benvenuto Cellini Lockington, F. W. Tom, Margarine of Barroth, G. B. Donington, Gellion, and Vidocq 15 vols. 12mo. <i>new</i> , <i>coll.</i> , <i>coll.</i> , £2. 15s (pub. at £9. 10s) |
| 839 | — A Topographical and Statistical Description of the British Possessions in North America, by Col. Leitch, 4 <i>l/.</i> , 3 vols. <i>pic. plates</i> , £1. 1s | 825 | BACON'S Works, 10 vols. 8vo. <i>best coll.</i> <i>new</i> , <i>gilt leaves</i> , £5. 186 |
| 840 | AMINTA Layola Pocheirey di Leopoldo Passa glia su via Leone Ridotta, 8vo. <i>b/.</i> <i>new</i> , <i>coll.</i> , by Hermy, 7s 1800 | 826 | BAKER'S Microscope made Easy, 8vo. <i>plates</i> 3s 6d 174 |
| 841 | ANCIENT Method Engraved chiefly from Original Sources, edited by the Rev. C. H. Hartshorne, cr. 8vo. <i>coll.</i> , 6s 1839 | 827 | BATES' Rural Philology, 8vo. <i>new</i> , 2s 1805 |
| 842 | ANDERSON'S Camps, 8vo. <i>l/.</i> <i>new</i> , 180d 1814 | 828 | — Christian Beliefs, 8vo. <i>new</i> , 2s 180 |
| 843 | ANDREWS' and Dury's Map of the Country 65 miles round London, from actual Surveys, atlas fol. 7s 6d 1809 | 829 | BEAUFORT'S Marston and other Poems, 12mo. <i>new</i> , 2s 6d 182 |
| 844 | ANNUAL REGISTER, Dodsley's, from the Commencement of 1793 to 1832, with the General List of the Army and Navy, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, | | |

Henry Coxhead,

- 50 BECKMANN'S History of Inventions, 1385
revised, 2 vols. 12mo. 6s 1823
- 51 BECKFORD'S Thoughts on Hunting, 8vo.
1786, 1788, 1789 1810
- 52 BELFORD on the Evil and Danger of Stage
Plays, 4 vol. 8s 1795
- 53 BELLET'S Edition of the Poets of Great Britain,
complete from Chaucer to Churchill, 109 vols.
18mo. calf, 5 guineas
- 54 BENTHAM'S (Jeremy) Elements of the Art
of Thinking, as applied to Special Juris, 8vo.
1781, 1788, 1791 1824
- 55 BERNARD (Hubert de) Manuel Theore-
tique et Pratique du Vigneron Français, 18mo.
1818 1827
- 56 BETHAM'S Baronetage of England, 5 vols.
Fols. bds. uncut, £1. 10s 1801
- 57 BEWICK'S British Birds, 2 vols. 8vo. very
fine new sets, £1. 15s 1832
- 58 BIBLIA Sacra Diadema, 12mo. calf, 9s 1819
- 59 BIBLIE, Common Prayer, and the Old and
New Versions of the Psalms, 5 vols. diamond
cutters, new, in a new case, 18s
- 60 BIBLIA Hebraica, sive Punctis, Forster, 4to.
1780, extra gilt leaves, a cerulea cover, £2. 17s
Ovenit, 1750
- 61 BIBLIA Hebraica, Christiano Reineccio edita,
cum variis Lectionibus Kenenotto, Rossi,
Wunderlen et Mesnier, 4to. rossa extra, gilt
leaves, £1. 12s 1795
- 62 BIOGRAPHICAL Dictionary of Living Au-
thors, 8vo. cloth, 2s
- 63 BLAIR'S Sermons, 5 vols. 8vo. calf, marb.
bds, 15s 1818
- 64 ——— Another copy, old calf, 10s 1773
- 65 BONAPARTE, Copies of Original Letters
from the Army of Bonaparte, intercepted by
the Elector and Lord Nelson, with an English
Translation, 8vo. calf, 2s 1796
- 66 BONNYCASTLE'S Astronomy, 8vo. plates,
calf, 2. 6d 1807
- 67 ——— Geomachy, 8vo. 2s 1811
- 68 BORLASE'S Antiquities of the County of
Cornwall, with a Vocabulary, fol. many plates,
etc. etc. p. £1. 18s 1769
- 69 BOSWELL'S Life of Johnson, 4 vols. 8vo.
1791, 1793, 1796 1820
- 70 BOSWELL'S Life of Johnson, the last and en-
tire, 8vo. 1793, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1812, 1813, 1814, 1815, 1816, 1817, 1818, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 2681, 2682, 2683, 2684, 2685, 2686, 2687, 2688, 2689, 2690, 2691, 2692, 2693, 2694, 2695, 2696, 2697, 2698, 2699, 2700, 2701, 2702, 2703, 2704, 2705, 2706, 2707, 2708, 2709, 2710, 2711, 2712, 2713, 2714, 2715, 2716, 2717, 2718, 2719, 2720, 2721, 2722, 2723, 2724, 2725, 2726, 2727, 2728, 2729, 2730, 2731, 2732, 2733, 2734, 2735, 2736, 2737, 2738, 2739, 2740, 2741, 2742, 2743, 2744, 2745, 2746, 2747, 2748, 2749, 2750, 2751, 2752, 2753, 2754, 2755, 2756, 2757, 2758, 2759, 2760, 2761, 2762, 2763, 2764, 2765, 2766, 2767, 2768, 2769, 2770, 2771, 2772, 2773, 2774, 2775, 2776, 2777, 2778, 2779, 2780, 2781, 2782, 2783, 2784, 2785, 2786, 2787, 2788, 2789, 2790, 2791, 2792, 2793, 2794, 2795, 2796, 2797, 2798, 2799, 2800, 2801, 2802, 2803, 2804, 2805, 2806, 2807, 2808, 2809, 2810, 2811, 2812, 2813, 2814, 2815, 2816, 2817, 2818, 2819, 2820, 2821, 2822, 2823, 2824, 2825, 2826, 2827, 2828, 2829, 2830, 2831, 2832, 2833, 2834, 2835, 2836, 2837, 2838, 2839, 2840, 2841, 2842, 2843, 2844, 2845, 2846, 2847, 2848, 2849, 2850, 2851, 2852, 2853, 2854, 2855, 2856, 2857, 2858, 2859, 2860, 2861, 2862, 2863, 2864, 2865, 2866, 2867, 2868, 2869, 2870, 2871, 2872, 2873, 2874, 2875, 2876, 2877, 2878, 2879, 2880, 2881, 2882, 2883, 2884, 2885, 2886, 2887, 2888, 2889, 2890, 2891, 2892, 2893, 2894, 2895, 2896, 2897, 2898, 2899, 2900, 2901, 2902, 2903, 2904, 2905, 2906, 2907, 2908, 2909, 2910, 2911, 2912, 2913, 2914, 2915, 2916, 2917, 2918, 2919, 2920, 2921, 2922, 2923, 2924, 2925, 2926, 2927, 2928, 2929, 2930, 2931, 2932, 2933, 2934, 2935, 2936, 2937, 2938, 2939, 2940, 2941, 2942, 2943, 2944, 2945, 2946, 2947, 2948, 2949, 2950, 2951, 2952, 2953, 2954, 2955, 2956, 2957, 2958, 2959, 2960, 2961, 2962, 2963, 2964, 2965, 2966, 2967, 2968, 2969, 2970, 2971, 2972, 2973, 2974, 2975, 2976, 2977, 2978, 2979, 2980, 2981, 2982, 2983, 2984, 2985, 2986, 2987, 2988, 2989, 2990, 2991, 2992, 2993, 2994, 2995, 2996, 2997, 2998, 2999, 3000, 3001, 3002, 3003, 3004, 3005, 3006, 3007, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011, 3012, 3013, 3014, 3015, 3016, 3017, 3018, 3019, 3020, 3021, 3022, 3023, 3024, 3025, 3026, 3027, 3028, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3033, 3034, 3035, 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, 3042, 3043, 3044, 3045, 3046, 3047, 3048, 3049, 3050, 3051, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3056, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3060, 3061, 3062, 3063, 3064, 3065, 3066, 3067, 3068, 3069, 3070, 3071, 3072, 3073, 3074, 3075, 3076, 3077, 3078, 3079, 3080, 3081, 3082, 3083, 3084, 3085, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 3090, 3091, 3092, 3093, 3094, 3095, 3096, 3097, 3098, 3099, 3100, 3101, 3102, 3103, 3104, 3105, 3106, 3107, 3108, 3109, 3110, 3111, 3112, 3113, 3114, 3115, 3116, 3117, 3118, 3119, 3120, 3121, 3122, 3123, 3124, 3125, 3126, 3127, 3128, 3129, 3130, 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140, 3141, 3142, 3143, 3144, 3145, 3146, 3147, 3148, 3149, 3150, 3151, 3152, 3153, 3154, 3155, 3156, 3157, 3158, 3159, 3160, 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164, 3165, 3166, 3167, 3168, 3169, 3170, 3171, 3172, 3173, 3174, 3175, 3176, 3177, 3178, 3179, 3180, 3181, 3182, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3186, 3187, 3188, 3189, 3190, 3191, 3192, 3193, 3194, 3195, 3196, 3197, 3198, 3199, 3200, 3201, 3202, 3203, 3204, 3205, 3206, 3207, 3208, 3209, 3210, 3211, 3212, 3213, 3214, 3215, 3216, 3217, 3218, 3219, 3220, 3221, 3222, 3223, 3224, 3225, 3226, 3227, 3228, 3229, 3230, 3231, 3232, 3233, 3234, 3235, 3236, 3237, 3238, 3239, 3240, 3241, 3242, 3243, 3244, 3245, 3246, 3247, 3248, 3249, 3250, 3251, 3252, 3253, 3254, 3255, 3256, 3257, 3258, 3259, 3260, 3261, 3262, 3263, 3264, 3265, 3266, 3267, 3268, 3269, 3270, 3271, 3272, 3273, 3274, 3275, 3276, 3277, 3278, 3279, 3280, 3281, 3282, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, 3295, 3296, 3297, 3298, 3299, 3300, 3301, 3302, 3303, 3304, 3305, 3306, 3307, 3308, 3309, 3310, 3311, 3312, 3313, 3314, 3315, 3316, 3317, 3318, 3319, 3320, 3321, 3322, 3323, 3324, 3325, 3326, 3327, 3328, 3329, 3330, 3331, 3332, 3333, 3334, 3335, 3336, 3337, 3338, 3339, 3340, 3341, 3342, 3343, 3344, 3345, 3346, 3347, 3348, 3349, 3350, 3351, 3352, 3353, 3354, 3355, 3356, 3357, 3358, 3359, 3360, 3361, 3362, 3363, 3364, 3365, 3366, 3367, 3368, 3369, 3370, 3371, 3372, 3373, 3374, 3375, 3376, 3377, 3378, 3379, 3380, 3381, 3382, 3383, 3384, 3385, 3386, 3387, 3388, 3389, 3390, 3391, 3392, 3393, 3394, 3395, 3396, 3397, 3398, 3399, 3400, 3401, 3402, 3403, 3404, 3405, 3406, 3407, 3408, 3409, 3410, 3411, 3412, 3413, 3414, 3415, 3416, 3417, 3418, 3419, 3420, 3421, 3422, 3423, 3424, 3425, 3426, 3427, 3428, 3429, 3430, 3431, 3432, 3433, 3434, 3435, 3436, 3437, 3438, 3439, 3440, 3441, 3442, 3443, 3444, 3445, 3446, 3447, 3448, 3449, 3450, 3451, 3452, 3453, 3454, 3455, 3456, 3457, 3458, 3459, 3460, 3461, 3462, 3463, 3464, 3465, 3466, 3467, 3468, 3469, 3470, 3471, 3472, 3473, 3474, 3475, 3476, 3477, 3478, 3479, 3480, 3481, 3482, 3483, 3484, 3485, 3486, 3487, 3488, 3489, 3490, 3491, 3492, 3493, 3494, 3495, 3496, 3497, 3498, 3499, 3500, 3501, 3502, 3503, 3504, 3505, 3506, 3507, 3508, 3509, 3510, 3511, 3512, 3513, 3514, 3515, 3516, 3517, 3518, 3519, 3520, 3521, 3522, 3523, 3524, 3525, 3526, 3527, 3528, 3529, 3530, 3531, 3532, 3533, 3534, 3535, 3536, 3537, 3538, 3539, 3540, 3541, 3542, 3543, 3544, 3545, 3546, 3547, 3548, 3549, 3550, 3551, 3552, 3553, 3554, 3555, 3556, 3557, 3558, 3559, 3560, 3561, 3562, 3563, 3564, 3565, 3566, 3567, 3568, 3569, 3570, 3571, 3572, 3573, 3574, 3575, 3576, 3577, 3578, 3579, 3580, 3581, 3582, 3583, 3584, 3585, 3586, 3587, 3588, 3589, 3590, 3591, 3592, 3593, 3594, 3595, 3596, 3597, 3598, 3599, 3600, 3601, 3602, 3603, 3604, 3605, 3606, 3607, 3608, 3609, 3610, 3611, 3612, 3613, 3614, 3615, 3616, 3617, 3618, 3619, 3620, 3621, 3622, 3623, 3624, 3625, 3626, 3627, 3628, 3629, 3630, 3631, 3632, 3633, 3634, 3635, 3636, 3637, 3638, 3639, 3640, 3641, 3642, 3643, 3644, 3645, 3646, 3647, 3648, 3649, 3650, 3651, 3652, 3653, 3654, 3655, 3656, 3657, 3658, 3659, 3660, 3661, 3662, 3663, 3664, 3665, 3666, 3667, 3668, 3669, 3670, 3671, 3672, 3673, 3674, 3675, 3676, 3677, 3

2, Newman's Row, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

- 905 CABINET Lawyer, thick vol. 18mo. *law calf*, 1832
6s
- 906 CAMPBELL on Pulpit Eloquence, 18mo. 2s 6d 1824
- 907 CARLISLE'S Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales, *with engravings*, 2 thick 8vo. vol's. £1. 1s (publ. at £2. 16s) 1843
- 908 CARMINA Bugesiana, *a volume from the Lee Priory Collection, with fine portrait of Sir Roger de Bridges*, royal 8vo. mor. £1. 1s
- 909 CAYLE'S Lives, Acts, Deaths, and Martyrdoms of those who were Contemporary with or immediately succeeded the Apostles, as also the Primitive Fathers, fol. *calf*, good copy, 9s 6d 1787
- 910 CHAPTAL, Chimie appliquée à l'Agriculture, 2 vols. 8vo. *net*, 6s 1849
- 911 CHAMCARD'S Large Map of Germany, Holland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Italy, &c. imp. fol. 6s 1800
- 912 CHEDWORTH'S (Lord) Notes upon some of the Obscure Passages in Shakspeare, 8vo. *bds*. 10s 6d *Privately Printed*, 1805
- 913 CHENRIEU, Recherches Chimiques sur les Corps Gais d'origine animale, 8vo. *net*, 3s 6d 1832
- 914 CHRISTIE'S Essay on the Eleusinian Mysteries, 8vo. 2s 6d 1847
- 915 CLARKE'S Gnomon, 8vo. *calf*, 4s 1793
- 916 ——— on the Church Catechism, 8vo. 4s 6d 1730
- 917 CLAVER'S Homerica, Patrick, 8vo. 5s 1812
- 918 COBBETT'S Political Register, 19 vols. roy. 8vo. 3 guineas (publ. at £24. 10s)
- 919 COKE'S (Roger) Detention of the Court and State of England, consisting of Private Memorials, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. *mor.*, 5s 6d 1694
- 920 COLLIER'S (Jeremy) View of the Profaneness and Immorality in the Church of England, 8vo. 2s 1735
- 921 ——— Essays upon Moral Subjects, 4 vols. 8vo. in 1, 4s 6d 1703
- 922 COLLINS'S Barometrical, 3 vols. 8vo. *many plates*, *calf*, £1. 11s 6d 1744
- 923 COMMON PRAYER, with Notes by Sir John Bayley, royal 8vo. *large type*, 3s 6d 1824
- 924 CONEY'S Cathedrals, Town-Halls, and Ancient Buildings of France, Germany, Holland, and Italy, imperial folio, *colour prints*, £6. 6s 1820
- 925 CONFESSIONS of an English Opium Eater, 12mo. 2s 6d 1824
- 926 CONVERSATIONS on Chemistry, 2 vols. 12mo. *net*, 1s 1849
- 927 COPPER PLATE Magazine, 3 vols. in 3, oblong 4to. *new fine copy*, *half calf*, £2. 3s
- 928 COWPER'S Poems, 2 vols. cr. 8vo. in 1, 6s 6d 1795
- 929 ——— with Illustrations, 2 vols. 8vo. *calf*, 9s 6d 1820
- 930 ——— ——— ——— 4mo. 2s 6d
- 931 COXE'S Picture of Italy, 12mo. 4s 18
- 932 CROKER'S Researches in the South of Ireland, *Itinerary*, 4s (publ. at £2. 2s 6d)
- 933 CROSBY'S Merchant and Tradesman's Pocket Dictionary, 18mo. 3s
- 934 CROWNE'S Physic, 2 vols. sm. 4to. *calf*, *fine copy*, *rare*, £2. 2s 16
- 935 CRUTWELL'S Gazetteer, 3 vols. 8vo. 1s 6d 1
- 936 DALL'S History and Antiquities of Haverham and Dover Court in Essex, *Itinerary*, 4s 17
- 937 DEBRET'S Poème, 2 vols. 3s 6d 16
- 938 DE CESSARE, Description des Travaux hydrauliques, de Ponts et Chaussées, de Commande de la Légion d'Honneur, Membre de plusieurs Académies et Sociétés savantes, avec soixante-sept planches, 2 vols. 4to. *bds*. £2. 5s 18
- 939 DELETANVILLE'S French Dictionary, 1 3s 6d 1
- 940 DELOLME on the British Constitution, 4 half *russia*, 4s 6d 18
- 941 DEMESTRIE de Etruria Regali, 2 vols. *many plates*, and *Passerius' Supplementum*, folio, *half calf*, *plates*, £2. 2s 1723
- 942 DERHAM'S Physico-Theology, 8vo. 2s 1
- 943 DESCRIPTION of 300 Animals, 8vo. *many woodcuts*, *calf*, 5s 18
- 944 DIBDIN on the Classics, 2 vols. in 1, *bound with MS. notes*, *half russia*, 10s 1
- 945 DIBDIN on the Classics, 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 18
- 946 DICTIONNAIRE raisonné universel d'Histoire Naturelle, par M. Valmout-Bonnet, vols. 4vo. *good copy*, £2. 2s 1
- 947 DICTIONNAIRE Technologique, ou Nomenclature des Arts et Métiers de l'Economie Industrielle et Commerciale, par une Société de Savants et d'Artistes, vols. 8vo. (4.) with 2 vols. 4to. and 3 part *plates*, *net*, £3. 1822
- 948 DICKSON'S Practical Agriculture, with best Methods of Planting, and improvement of Live Stock, *many plates*, 2 vols. 4to. 18s (publ. at £4. 1s)
- 949 DON JUAN, 2 vols. 12mo. *cloth*, 1s 1
- 950 ——— complete, 3 vols. 12mo. *cf.* 2s 18
- 951 DRAYCOT'S Morning in Spring, 8vo. 2s 1s 6d 16
- 952 DRAMATIC Saviour, 12mo. 200 *coloured plates*, 4s
- 953 DRYDEN'S Virgil, 2 vols. 18mo. *new copy*, 6s 16
- 954 ——— ——— 4 vols. 12mo. *calf*, 3s 6d 16
- 955 ——— ——— 3 vols. 12mo. *new copy* 16
- 956 DU NAYCH, a Tale of the Splendid City, 4to. 4s 6d 1
- 957 ELLIHAM, Plots, Characters, Scenarios, Faints and Views of the Great Hall of the Palace of Versailles, 4to. 10s 6d 16

Henry Coxhead,

- 58 ENCYCLOPEDIA Britannica, 3rd edition, with the Supplement, 22 vols. 4to. *hf. russiat*, £7. 7s
- 59 EURIPIDIS, cura Porsoni, 8vo. *ucat*, 6s 1821
- 60 EVELYN'S Memoirs, 5 vols. 8vo. *hf. morocco*, £2. 2s
- 61 FACCIOLATI, Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, Parly, 2 vols. 4to. *cloth bds.* £5. 15s 1828
- 62 FAIRY Mythology, 2 vols. 12mo. *bds. plates*, 3s 6d 1823
- 63 FAIRY Legends and Fictions of the South of Ireland, 3 vols. 12mo. *bds.* 18s (pub. at £1. 11s 6d) 1826
- 64 FAUBLAS, Vie du Chevalier, par Louvet de Couvray, avec figures, 3 vols. 18mo. in 1, 3s 1820
- 65 FAMILY Library, 3s per volume—
Æschylus—Lives of British Physicians—Scott's Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft—Brewster's Natural Magic—Ford's Plays, 2 vols.—Life of Columbus—Voyages of the Companions of Columbus.
- 66 FAMILY Classical Library—
Herodotus, 5 vols. 3s 6d 1850
- 67 FARADAY'S Chemical Manipulation, being Instructions to Students in Chemistry, 8vo. *real*, 7s 6d 1827
- 68 FERGUSON'S Lectures, 8vo. *calif*, 2s 1781
- 69 FIDDES'S Life of Cardinal Wolsey, folio, *good copy*, 11s 1721
- 70 FIELDING'S Works, by Murphy, 10 vols. 8vo. *half calf, best edition*, £2. 3s 1821
- 71 ———— 12 vols. 12mo. *calif*, £1. 1s 1766
- 72 FONTENELLE, (Julia de) Manuel de Physique Amusante, 18mo. *plates*, 2s 6d 1832
- 73 FRANCIS' Horace, 18mo. 1s 6d 1836
- 74 FRANKLIN'S Sophocles, 2 vols. 8vo. 1s 1766
- 75 FRANKLIN (Benj.) Life of, 12mo. *bds.* 2s 1826
- 76 FUDGE Family in Paris, by F. Brown, 12mo. *bds.* 7s 1818
- 77 GAY-LUSSAC, Cours de Chimie, comprenant l'Histoire des Sels, la Chimie Végétale et Animale, 2 vols. 8vo. *real*, 7s 6d 1823
- 78 GELNER'S Works, 5 vols. 12mo. *hf. calif*, 3s 1802
- 79 GELL'S Pompeiana, The Topography, Description, and Ornament of Pompeii, the result of Excavations, 1829, 11s. *plates &c.* 2 vols. bound in one vol., £1. 10s
- 80 GELLESIA, of the Reign of Frederick II., of Prussia, &c. &c. 1s 1769
- 81 GELIBIAS, translated by Smollett, 3 vols. 12mo. 1s 1766
- 82 GELBORN'S Sermons, 8vo. 7s 1807
- 83 GODWIN'S History of the Commonwealth, 4 vols. 8vo. *real*, £1. 15s 1823
- 84 GODDSMITH'S Remo, 8vo. 3vo. *copy*, 1s 1850
- 85 GOOD'S Book of Nature, 3 vols. 12mo. *cloth*, £1. 4s 1834
- 86 GORDON'S History of Ireland, 2 vols. 8vo. *calif, good copy*, 10s 6d 1806
- 87 GRANGER'S Biographical History of England, 6 vols. 8vo. *cloth*, 10s 1824
- 88 GROSE'S Antiquities of England, Wales, and Scotland, 10 vols. 4to. *fine impressions, half russiat*, £3. 18s 6d 1783-91
- 89 GUARDIAN, 2 vols. 12mo. 3s 6d
- 90 GUICCIARDINI Istoria d'Italia dalla Società Tipografica dei Classici Italiani in Milano, da Rolandi, 10 vols. in 5, *calif eleg.* £1. 10s 1821
- 91 GWILTS Rudiments of Architecture, with plates, Parts 1, 3 and 4, wants part 2, 1s 6d (cost £1. 2s 6d) 1826
- 92 HAMLETON'S (Sir Wm.) Greek, Roman, and Etruscan Vases, royal 4to. 62 plates by Kich, 15s 6d 1804
- 93 HASSELL'S Beauties of Antiquity, 2 vols. in 1, many plates, *real, half morocco*, 3s 1806
- 94 HAY'S History of Chichester, 8vo. *bds. uncut*, 1s 6d 1804
- 95 HAMPTON'S Polybius, 2 vols. 8vo. *bds.* 8s 1823
- 96 HEADLY'S Select Beauties of Ancient English Poetry, 2 vols. 8vo. *calif*, 6s 1787
- 97 HEARNES Robert of Gloucester, and Peter Langtoft's Chronicles, 4 vols. 8vo. *bds. uncut*, 12s 6d 1810
- 98 HEATH'S Book of Beauty, for 1833, 1, 3, sm. 8vo. *morocco*, £1. 11s 6d
- 99 HENRY'S Epitome of Chemistry, 18mo. 1s 6d 1801
- 1000 HERMITE de la Chaussée-d'Antin, Le Franc Parleur, l'Hermite de la Guiane, et l'Hermite en Province, 12 vols. 12mo. *plates*, £1. 1s 1813-19
- 1001 HISTORY of Singing Birds, 12mo. *calif*, 2s 1791
- 1002 ———— of the Hagellants, 8vo. *calif, scarce*, 7s 1785
- 1003 HOARE'S Geraldus Cambrensis, 2 vols. 4to. many fine plates, &c. *mar. leaves*, £2. 15s 1806
- 1004 HOLBEIN'S Portraits of Illustrious Persons of the Court of Henry the Eighth, in the Collection of His Majesty, with Biographical Tracts by Chamberlaine, engraved and coloured in imitation of the Original Drawings (311), royal 4to. *half mor. uncut, gilt top*, £2. 10s 1812
- 1005 HODGINS' Court Annual, 1830, 1, 2, 3, & 4, 4 vols. £1. 3s
- 1006 HOLY BIBLE Bensley's, with engravings by Lister, 2 vols. imperial 8vo. *blue morocco, with joints*, £1. 10s 1795
- 1007 HOLY BIBLE, with Notes, selected from the Works of several Eminent Divines, very large type, 4 vols. 8vo. *rough calif*, £1. 5s 1774
- 1008 HUME and Smollett's History of England, 13 vols. 8vo. *bds.* £1. 10s 1808
- 1009 ———— Crutwell's last edition, 10 vols. 8vo. *half mor. mar. leaves*, £4. 10s
- 1010 ———— ———— Crutwell's last edition, 10 vols. 18mo. 10s 1795


- 1010 INGRAM'S Memorials of Oxford, with engravings by Le Keux, 2 vols. 8vo. half morocco, uncut, gilt tops, £1. 7s
- 1011 ITALIAN School of Painting, 150 plates, engraved by Bartolozzi from original Pictures and Drawings of Guercino and others, 2 vols. imp. 4to. morocco back, £3. 13s
- 1012 JACKSON'S Chronological Antiquities, 3 vols. 4to. Large Paper, cf. good copy, £1. 7s 1752
- 1013 JAMESON'S System of Mineralogy, 3 vols. 8vo. bds. uncut, many plates, 10s 6d 1804
- 1014 JOHNSON'S Lives of the Poets, 4 vols. 8vo. 7s 6d 1783
- 1015 ——— 2 vols. 12mo. 4s 1824
- 1016 ——— Works, with his Debates in Parliament, complete, 11 vols. 8vo. calf gilt, £4. 4s Pickering, 1825
- 1017 JONSON'S (Ben) Works, folio, good copy, 15s 1692
- 1018 JORTIN'S Ecclesiastical History, 5 vols. 8vo. calf £1. 1s 1751
- 1019 JUNIUS' Letters, 2 vols. 12mo. cf. 5s 1783
- 1020 KELHAMS' Norman Dictionary, and Laws of William the Conqueror, 8vo. bds. uncut, scarce, 13s
- 1021 KENT'S View of the Agriculture of Norfolk 8vo. 2s 1796
- 1022 KLY to both Houses of Parliament, 8vo. 5s 1832
- 1023 KING'S Sermons, 8vo. bds. 4s 6d 1827
- 1024 KNOX'S Essays, 2 vols. 12mo. 3s 6d 1827
- 1025 KEEPSAKE for 1834-5, 2 vols. sm. 8vo. silk, £1.
- 1026 ——— 1830, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 vols. Large Paper, proof impressions on India paper, £5. 5s (pub. at 15 guineas.)
- 1027 KOTZEBE'S Travels through Italy, 1 vol. 12mo. calf, 6s 1807
- 1028 LANDOR'S Imaginary Conversations of Literary Men, and Statesmen, 3 vols. 8vo. bds. 2d edition, 12s 1826-28
- 1029 LARDNER'S Works, by Kippis, 11 vols. 8vo. calf; a fine old set, £4. 3s 1788
- 1030 LA PLACES Astronomy and System of the World, translated by Pond, 2 vols. cr. 8vo. hf. russia, scarce, 10s 6d 1809
- 1031 LATHAMS' General History of Birds, and Index, 11 vols. 4to. hf. uncut, numerous coloured plates, 3 guineas and a half, (pub. at £22.) 1824-28
- 1032 LEAKE'S Topography of Athens, 8vo. many plates, 7s 6d
- 1033 LEDWICH'S Antiquities of Ireland, 4to. many plates, calf, £1. 4s 1790
- 1034 LEMPRIERE'S Classical Dictionary, 8vo. 5s 6d 1650
- 1035 LINCOLNSHIRE, (Greenwood's Map of,) mounted on vellum, and in a velvet morocco case, £4. 3s 1830
- 1036 LIVIUS (Titus) History of, with the entire Supplement of John Freinsheim, 3 vols. royal 8vo. 11, calf, 48s 1644
- 1037 LLOYD'S Christian Theology, 8vo. 2s 1804
- 1038 LOCKE on the Human Understanding, 2 vols. 8vo. calf, 8s 6d 1796
- 1038* ——— Another copy, 2 vols. 5s 1731
- 1039 LODGE'S Portraits, the first 6 parts, containing 30 portraits, calf, £1. 8s.
- 1040 LONG'S Astronomy, 2 vols. 4to. many plates, bds. uncut, scarce, 8s 6d 1742
- 1041 LONGINUS de Sublimitate, Tollius, 4to. 4s 1694
- 1042 LOUDON'S Encyclopædia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture, and Furniture, very thick 8vo. illustrated by nearly 100 lithographs, and above 2000 engravings on wood, £2. 14s 1834
- 1043 ——— Encyclopædia of Gardening, very thick, 8vo. many engravings on wood, £1. 12s
- 1044 LOUNGER, 3 vols. 12mo. calf, 3s 1788
- 1045 MALLETT'S Works, 3 vols. 12mo. calf, good copy, 6s 1759
- 1046 MACARTNEY'S Embassy to China, by Sir Geo. Staunton, 3 vols. 8vo. hf. russia, 6s 6d 1797
- 1047 MARCHMONT Papers, selected by the Rt. Hon. Sir G. Rose, 3 vols. 8vo. bds. uncut, 15s 1831
- 1048 MANN on the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, 12mo. 2s
- 1049 MARTYN'S Dictionary of Natural History, numerous coloured plates, 2 vols. folio, russia, £2. 3s 1785
- 1050 MEADLEY'S Memoirs of Paley, 8vo. bds. 2s 6d 1810
- 1051 MEMOIRS of Jeanne D'Arc, surnamed La Pucelle D'Orléans; with the History of her Times, 2 vols. 8vo. Large Paper, cloth, plates, £1. 4s (pub. at 4 guineas) 1824
- 1052 MILTON'S Paradise Lost, Heptastich's edition, fine engravings, royal 8vo. calf, 12s 1799
- 1053 MILLS' British India, 6 vols. 8vo. calf elegant, £2. 4s
- 1054 MIRROR for Magistrates, edited by Joseph Hazlewood, 3 vols. 4to. calf, gilt leaves, by C. Lewis, a fine copy, £5. 5s 1815
- 1055 MODERN Traveller, by Josiah Conder, 33 vols. 18mo. cloth, 4 guineas
- 1056 MONK (The) by Lewis, printed verbatim from the first London edition, 4s 1832
- 1057 MONTAGU'S Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakspeare, 8vo. 2s 1765
- 1058 MONTJOIE, Flore Historique et Fumée de Louis 16, Du Nom. 8vo. bds. 2s 1797
- 1059 MUSEUM of Painting and Sculpture, or, Collection of the Principal Pictures, Statues, and Bas Reliefs in the Public and Private Galleries of Europe, drawn and etched on Steel by Revel, with Descriptive, Critical, and Historical Notices, many colouring plates, 14 vols. 12mo. at, morocco, uncut, gilt tops, 7 guineas and a half
- 1060 MURGRAVE'S Book of the Psalms of David, in English Blank Verse, 8vo. bds. 3s 1833
- 1061 NEW Year's Gift 12mo. and on plates, 3s 6d 1834

- 1062 NEWELL'S Scenery of Wales, royal 8vo. 4s.
 1063 NEWTON'S (Sir Isaac) Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms amended, 4to, *scarce*, 3s 1723
 1064 NICHOLSON'S British Encyclopædia, 6 vols. 8vo. many plates, *hf. morocco, marb. leaves*, £2. 5s
 1065 NORTH'S Lives of the Norths, 3 vols. 8vo. *hf. morocco*, £1. 1s 1826
 1066 NOVA M Testamentum Grace cura Leusdenii et Giesbachi, 18mo. *calif.*, 4s 1823
 1067 NOVEAU Testament, 12mo. 1s 6d 1662
 1068 ORR'S Theory of Religion, 8vo. 2s 1762
 1069 OATH'S Art of Love, 2s.
 1070 ———— Inveective, or Curse against His, translated into English Verse, by Jones, 18mo. *calif. gilt leaves*, 5s 1667
 1071 OXFORD Classics, consisting of Hume and Smollett, 13 vols.—Robertson's Works, 3 vols. —Poiswell's Life of Johnson, 1 vol. —Johnson's Works, with his Debates in Parliament, 44 vols. and Gibbons' Rome, 8 vols. forming the complete series (44 vols.) of the Oxford Classics, *Large Paper, with proof impressions of the portraits on India paper*; together with Gibbons' Miscellaneous Works, 5 vols. 8vo. *Large Paper, to correspond, making in the whole 49 vols. royal 8vo. elegantly hf. bound, crimson morocco, with gilt tops*, 50 guineas, (less than 1s per vol.) cost 60 guineas.
 1072 ———— A Similar Series, *Small Paper, new, to call.*, elegant, 3s per volume.
Author of the articles comprised in the last mentioned series, may be had separate.
 1073 PACKS (Major) Miscellanies in Verse and Prose, 8vo. 2s. 1719
 1074 PALLAS'S Evidences of Christianity, 2 vols. *bs.*, 6s 6d 1817
 1075 ———— Philosophy, 18mo. 2s 6d 1824
 1076 ———— ———— 8vo. *hds.*, 3s 1817
 1077 PALLAS'S Travels in Russia, 2 vols. 4to, with 120 *coloured plates, green morocco, gilt leaves*, £4. 11s 6d 1842
 1078 PARIS and Poulhaque's Medical Jurisprudence, 3 vols. *hds.*, 44s. 1823
 1079 PARKES'S Chemical Catechism, 8vo. *calif.*, 7s 1826
 1080 ———— Essays, 2 vols. 8vo. containing 24 plates, *neat*, 12s 1823
 1081 PARKHURST'S Greek and English Lexicon, royal 8vo. *hf. calif.*, 6s 6d. 1817
 1082 PARKINSON'S Organic Remains of a Former World, an Examination of the Mineral and Remains of the Vegetables and Animals of the Antediluvian World, generally termed Plutonian Fossils, *new, coloured plates*, 3 vols. 8vo. *cloth, bds.*, 4 guineas. 1823
 1083 PARSONS'S Minor Theatre, 7 vols. plates, 10s 6d 1794
 1084 PASCAL'S Thoughts on Religion, 8vo. *calif.*, 2s 6d 1805
 1085 PASTOR'S Euboch Grammatica Græcæ, 2 vol. 8vo. *neat, morocco, of Heine*, 1s 1800
 1086 PAUSANIAS' Description of Greece, 3 vols. 8vo. *half calif.*, 15s 1824
 1087 PAYEN. La Chimie enseignée en Vingt-six Leçons, 12mo. *neat*, 2s 6d 1827
 1088 PELOUZE, Manuel du Manufacturier ou Archives, 12mo. *neat*, 2s 6d 1826
 1089 PEMBERTON'S View of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophy, 4to. many plates, 1s 1723
 1090 PERCY'S Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, 3 vols. cr. 8vo. *calif.*, 18s 1812
 1091 ———— Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, 3 vols. cr. 8vo. 15s 1810
 1091* ———— Another copy, 4 vols. *neat*, 10s 6d 1825
 1092 PERSIAN and Turkish Tales, 2 vols. 24mo. *calif.*, 1s 6d 1809
 1093 PETER PINDAR'S Works, 4 vols. 18mo. *calif.*, 7s 1809
 1094 PERU (Account of), 4to. *coloured plates*, 5s 6d 1805
 1095 PHELAN (Dr.) Remains of, by John, Bishop of Limerick, 2 vols. 8vo. *hds.*, 11s 1832
 1096 PHILOSOPHIA Vetus et Nova ad usum Scholæ accommodata in Regia Burgundiana per Tractata, 4to. 2 vols. in 1, 5s 6d 1685
 1097 PHILLIPS'S Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum, containing Brief Characters of the English Poets down to the Year 1675, with Notes by Sir Egerton Brydges, Bart. 8vo. 12s (*only 100 copies printed*) 1824
 1097* PICTURESQUE Annual for 1832, 5, 1, and 5, 4 vols. *Large Paper, morocco, gilt leaves*, 4 guineas, (pub. at 10 guineas)
 1098 PIERCES Superevagation, or a New Praise of the Old Ass, by Gabriel Harvey, and a New Letter of Notable Contents, with a Strange Sonnet, 4to. *hds.*, 7s 1815
 1099 PINELLI, Raccolta di No. 100, Soggetti dipinti Rimaneyoli dell' Istoria Romana ed Greca Illustrata da Bertocchi, 2 vols. oblong 4to. *half calif.*, £2. 10s Roma, 1821
 1100 PINKERTON'S Geography, 8vo. maps, 1s 1811
 1101 ———— Scottish Tragic and Comic Ballads, 2 vols. in 1, *calif. scarce*, 6s 6d 1781-3
 1102 PLAYS, a Volume of Old, sm. 4to. *half russ.*, 6s 1700
 1103 PLAYFAIR'S System of Chronology, folio, 12s 1764
 1104 FLOWDEN'S Historical Review of the State of Ireland from the Invasion under Henry II. to the Union, 3 vols. 4to. *calif.*, 2 vol. copy, £1. 10s 1803
 1105 PLUTARCH'S Lives by Langhorne and Wrangham, last edit. 6 vols. 8vo. *hf. cloth*, £1 3s 1826
 1106 ———— Another copy, *calif.*, £1. 15s
 1107 POPE'S Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, 4 vols. 4mo. *calif.*, 6s 1806
 1108 PLAMPIER'S Residence in France, 3 vols. 8vo. *neat*, 1s 1810

- 1109 PORTEUS' Lectures on St. Matthew, 2 vols. 8vo. *bds.* 3s 6d 1819
- 1110 PORTO. Dictionarium Ionicum Græco Latium, 8vo. *bds.* 4s 1824
- 1111 POLYGLOTT Bible (Baxter's), English and French Versions, *purple morocco, gilt leaves*, £1. 12s (sells for 3 guineas) 1831
- 1112 POTTER'S Antiquities of Greece, by Dugbar, 2 vols. 8vo. *calf*, 11s 1824
- 1113 ——— Antiquities of Greece, 2 vols. 8vo. *calf*, 9s 6d 1765
- 1114 ——— Antiquities of Greece, 2 vols. 8vo. 6s 6d 1761
- 1115 POTTER'S (R.) Sophocles, 8vo. *neat*, 3s 6d 1813
- 1116 ——— Aeschylus, 8vo. *calf*, 3s 6d 1808
- 1117 ——— 8vo. 2 vols. *calf*, 5s 1779
- 1118 PRESTON'S Illustrations of Masonry, 12mo. *bds.* 3s 6d 1829
- 1119 PRIDEAUX'S Connection, 4 vols. 8vo. *calf*, *many plates, fine old copy*, £1. 3s 1729
- 1120 PUGIN and Heath's Paris and its Environs, 4to. 100 views, 2 vols. in 1, *morocco extra*, £2. 10s 1831
- 1121 ——— Another copy, 2 vols. *half mor.* £1. 16s 1831
- 1122 PURSUITS of Literature, a Satirical Poem, with Notes, 8vo. *calf*, 4s 6d 1736
- 1123 PYLÆS Paraphrase on the Acts of the Apostles, 2 vols. 8vo. 5s 1137
- 1124 ——— Paraphrase on the Revelation of St. John, 8vo. 2s 1755
- 1125 PYNES Royal Residences, 3 vols. 4to. *an original copy, plates coloured*, 7 guineas, (pub. at 25 guineas) 1809-15
- 1126 QUARTERLY REVIEW complete, with both the General Indices, 52 vols. 8vo. *half calf*, 10 guineas 1809-15
- 1127 QUINN'S Historical Atlas, in a Series of Maps of the World as known at different periods, coloured according to the Political Changes of each Period, accompanied by a Narrative of the Leading Events exhibited in the Maps, which are engraved by Schrey Hall, Edin. £2. 5s (pub. at £3. 10s) 1830
- 1128 RAY'S Collection of English Proverbs, and an Appendix of Hebræ & Proverbs, 4mo. 8s 1s 1623
- 1129 RICHARDSON'S Zoology of North America, 2 vols. 12mo. *neat, with a coloured bound, bound in a large elegant morocco a half* 1829
- 1130 RICHARDSON on the Metabolic Arts, 8vo. 4s 1829
- 1131 RICHARDSON'S Sermons, 2 vols. 8vo. *neat*, 3s 6d 1806
- 1132 ROLLIN'S Ancient History, 8 vols. 8vo. *best edition, half calf*, £4. 10s 1817
- 1133 ROLLIN'S on Faith and Good Works, 8vo. *calf*, 2s 1760
- 1134 ROSSIETAL Chævres, 11 vols. 8vo. *calf*, 2nd ed. set, £4. 15s 1820
- 1135 RUSSELL'S Travels in the East, 2 vols. 8vo. 1820
- 1136 SARDANAPALUS, Two Foscari, and Cain, 8vo. *bds.* 4s 6d 1821
- 1137 SALLUS Korin, 2 vol. 8vo. *bds. uncut*, 18s 1825
- 1138 SANCIO. or the Proverbialist, 8vo. *bds.* 2s 6d 1816
- 1139 SELECT Specimens of Foreign and Indigenous Plants, *numerous coloured plates*, 8vo. *ht. bds. morocco, uncut, gilt top*, £4. 1s 1820
- 1140 SCOTTS (SIR WALTER) Tales of a Grandfather, 9 vols. *neat*, £4. 1s 1820
- 1141 SICKLES'S Lectures on the Catechism, 12mo. 2s 1624
- 1142 SELDEN'S (John) God made Man, a Tract, proving the Nativity of our Saviour to be on the 24th of Dec. 12mo. *scarce*, 3s 6d 1661
- 1143 SHAKESPEARE'S Plays, by Johnson and Stevens, 10 vols. 8vo. *calf*, *good copy*, 2 guineas and a half 1773
- 1144 ——— Poems, plates, *calf*, 4s 1820
- 1145 SHAW'S General Zoology, or Systematic Natural History, 28 vols. 8vo. *numerous plates by Heath and others, fine impressions, half morocco, mangled leaves*, 12 guineas and a half, 1800-25—Another copy, *in bds.* £10. 1820
- 1146 ——— Zoological Lectures, *many plates*, 2 vols. 8vo. *Large Paper, et. extra*, £2. 1809
- 1147 SMIDS. Romanorum Imperatorum Pinacotheca, sm. 4to. *curious plates*, 2s 6d 1639
- 1148 SMOLLETT'S Miscellaneous Works, 6 vols. 8vo. *bds.* £1. 1820
- 1149 SMITH'S Phas for Schism and Infidelity Reviewed, 8vo. 1s 6d 1717
- 1150 SMITH'S Wealth of Nations, 3 vols. 8vo. *calf*, 7s 6d 1799
- 1151 SMIRKE'S Specimens of Continental Architecture, folio, *coloured plates*, part 1, 1s 6d 1806
- 1152 SOUTHEY'S select British Poets, from Chaucer to Johnson, thick 8vo. *cloth bds.* £4. 7s (see *John's Poets*) 1831
- 1153 SOUTHEY'S Book of the Church, 2 vols. 8vo. *half morocco, scarce*, £4. 1s 1824
- 1154 SPECTACLE de la Nature, 3 vols. *many plates*, 10s 6d 1752
- 1155 SPECTATOR, 9 vols. *Johnson's Edit.* 3s 1712
- 1156 SPENCE'S Polymetry, folio, *calf*, *1 vol. comp.*, £2. 5s 1760
- 1157 SPRINGELL'S Elements of the Philosophy of Plants, 8vo. *plates*, 3s 6d 1820
- 1158 STANHOPE on the Epistles and Gospels, 4 vols. 8vo. *calf*, *2nd copy*, £4. 10s 1817
- 1159 STATUTE of Liberty from Magna Charta to Edward of William IV. 20 vols. 4to. *neat calf*, *1 vol. set*, £22 (cost upwards of £60) 1820
- 1160 STELLINE'S Sermons, 8vo. *calf*, 3s 6d 1737
- 1161 STELLINE'S Sports and Pastimes of the People of England, by Horn, 8vo. *neat*, 1s 1820
- 1162 TAYLOR'S Annals of St. Mary Overy, an Historical and Descriptive Account of St. Saviour's Church and Parish, *with numerous illustrations*, 11s 1820
- 1163 THICKNESS'S Year's Journey through the Kingdom of France, 8vo. 1s 1820

8 H. Coxhead, 4, Newman's Row, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

1164 THOMSON'S System of Chemistry, 5 vols. 8vo. bds. 9s 1307	1176 VIEWS (75) of Italy and France, a similar collection to the last, from drawings by Hard- ing, proof impressions on india paper, folio, half morocco, gilt leaves, 3 guineas 1834
1165 THROSBY'S Memoirs of the Town and County of Leicester, 18mo. 6 vols. in 3, plates, 7s 6d —	1174 VENN'S Sermons, 3 vols. 8vo. bds. uncut, 15s 1818
1166 TRACTS. A Volume (Divinity), 2vo. 2s 6 y.	1177 VIRGILII Opera, Masvicius, 2 vols. 4to. many plates, £1. 1s 1717
1167 TRIALS of Margaret Lindsay, 12mo. cloth, 2s 6d —	1178 WARNER'S Literary Recollections, 2 vols. 8vo. bds. 10s 1830
1168 TRYALS, a Volume of Curious, 8vo. 1s 1745	1179 WATSON'S Collection of Theological Tracts, 6 vols. 8vo. calf, £2. 5s 1791
1169 TURNER'S Annual Picturesque Tour for 1835, 1, & 5, 3 vols. sm. 8vo. £1. 16s (pub. at 4 guineas) — Another copy, Large Paper, proof impressions, morocco extra, £2. 15s	1180 WATSON'S Philip the Third, 2 vols. 8vo. calf, scarce, £1. 1s 1808
1170 TURNER'S Elements of Chemistry, 8vo. 9s 1823	1181 WEEVER'S Ancient Funeral Monuments, folio, calf, very fine preservation, £1.10s 1631
1171 VAUQUELIN, Dictionnaire de Chimie, 12mo. neat, 2s 6d 1376	1182 WHITE'S Essay on Indigenous Grasses of Ireland, 8vo. bds. 2s 1803
1172 VALENTIA'S (Lord) Voyages and Travels, 5 vols. 4to. Large Paper, many plates, russia, gilt leaves, £2. 10s 1809	1183 WOODS Elements of Algebra, 8vo. calf, 2s 1801
1173 VANCOUVER'S Voyage, 6 vols. 8vo. calf, 12s 1801	1184 YOUNG'S Lectures on Natural Philosophy, and the Mechanical Arts, 2 vols. 4to. half russia, 5 guineas 1807
1175 VIEWS (104) of Switzerland and Italy, adapted to illustrate Byron, Rogers, Eustace, and other Works on Italy, from drawings by Pronot and Harding, proof impressions on india paper, 2 vols. folio, half morocco, gilt leaves, 4 guineas 1833	1185 YOUNG'S Discoveries in Hieroglyphical Li- terature and Egyptian Antiquities, 8vo. bds. 3s 6d 1823

 Country Orders must be accompanied by an Order for Payment in London.

G. NORMAN, PRINTER, MAIDEN LANE, COVENT GARDEN.

